MAY 25 1956

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by
Bishop & Mrs. G. D. Batdorf
Dayton, Ohio

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/ministerialethic0000revn

MINISTERIAL ETHICS AND ETIQUETTE

MINISTERIAL ETHICS AND ETIQUETTE

BY
REV. NOLAN B. HARMON, JR., M.A.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BV
4012
.H3
12,581

NASHVILLE, TENN.
COKESBURY PRESS
1928

COPYRIGHT, 1928
BY
LAMAR & WHITMORE

Printed in the United States of America

To

MY MOTHER

JULIET HOWE HARMON

WHO TAUGHT ME
WAYS OF GENTLENESS
AS WELL AS OF
CHRISTIAN LIVING

MAY 25 1959 UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PREFACE

It goes without saying that the minister is a Christian and it goes with this saying that he is a gentleman. This is the base line of the code which we propose to assemble in the following pages. We accept it as an axiom that every minister is a Christian gentleman.

It has long been a belief of the writer that the true Christian will always know how to conduct himself everywhere. We do not mean that the moment a man or minister is consecrated to God he will automatically know "which fork to use first," or "what is wrong with this picture." The fashion of this world changeth, and so do the pretty—and petty—little customs that prevail among ladies and gentlemen. But beneath the whole gamut of matters discussed in the "Blue Book"—knives and forks, soup and fish, the cutting of cabbages and the treatment of kings—there are a few deep principles, and these principles, the postulates upon which gentlemen act, are not far from a Christian ethic. A gentleman may not be a Christian, but a Christian must be a gentleman. If worldly-wise sinners can achieve a high plane of courtesy and honor, surely the men of God can do no less. We have seen old mountain preachers, ignorant of all the usages of polite society, but, saturated with the grace of God through years of service, they showed forth in face and bearing a graceful tenderness and air of Christian courtliness that the halls of Versailles might well have envied. *Unselfishness*, or a pretense at it, underlies the whole code of proper conduct in the "Blue Book";

but with the Christian it may not be pretense. Taking thought for others is the essence of ministerial ethics and etiquette.

Perhaps it was the instinctive and hopeful desire to realize this ideal which prevented until quite recently any appearance of a specific formulary or outward code of ministerial ethics. Certainly there has never been any binding code of ethical conduct drawn up for the ministry, and in the nature of things perhaps there never can be. "It (the ministry) is the oldest profession in the history of mankind, and yet has no carefully worked-out schedule of professional work nor of ministerial ethics. There is no profession in which his relations to his fellow men and coworkers is so loosely defined."[1] Rev. S. Z. Batten, D.D., explained this as due to the fact that the ministry is more of a *calling* than a *profession*. "The standards of the ministry include the personal and private life, whereas professional codes deal primarily with professional conduct." This is entirely true, and yet we believe the objection to a binding code of ministerial ethics goes far deeper. The following reasons briefly stated will be clearly recognized as sufficient to block any attempt to establish a general binding code of ministerial ethics, and will make any work upon the subject merely suggestive.

1. It is impossible to get general agreement among ministers on points having to do with ethics and morals. We have many churches and sects to-day which cannot agree on some of the greater moral questions. How then may we expect them to agree

[1] Leach, "Church Administration," p. 24.

upon minor matters having to do with moot points of ethical conduct or, in some cases, mere etiquette?

2. There is not and cannot be any interdenominational court or tribunal to enforce upon any minister a system governing his morals or his conduct. He is a law unto himself. If his fathers went to war to prevent men from telling them how they should kneel or stand or sit at Communion, he is not going to let anyone tell him to-day how to make a pastoral call or what church publicity he may use. The whole system of Protestantism is wound up with the individual's rights in this matter.

3. The denominations have their individual regulations governing their own ministers on many questions having to do with ethical conduct, and they leave other matters to the obligation every minister is under to keep the moral law and live as a Christian. The Protestant Episcopal Church, for instance, has its Canon Law; the Methodist Episcopal Churches, their "Discipline," and to these the men of the respective churches look for guidance and authority upon many questions of ethical procedure.

4. The minister himself is supposed to be an arbiter in the field of morals and ethics; and since he is personally regarded as a judge and divider in such matters, he is trusted to regulate his own personal conduct properly. As soon expect—it might be argued—a medical association to draw up health rules for physicians or to issue a book on what medicine is good for a doctor, as to expect ministers to tell each other what courses of moral and ethical conduct are proper.

5. Furthermore the matters involved are not of great moment. They have to do with jots and tittles

and scarcely ever touch the inflexible bulwarks and buttresses of the moral law. When a matter does go over into a question of morals, then the minister's conscience, not to say his church, speaks up. But many courses of conduct can be rightly classed as matters of small importance.

Nevertheless, and in spite of all the above, there has gradually evolved through the years a ministerial consciousness. Perhaps this is not well. Henry Ward Beecher, it may be guessed, would not have thought so, as he did not believe the ministry should stick together as a unit. But call it by what name we will, this vague, intangible, interdenominational professional consciousness is alive among the ministry to-day, and it is our purpose in this work to try to establish its sanctions and codify its findings. These sanctions, it is admitted, cannot be enforced by physical means, but by general opinion and the consensus of ministerial approval or disapproval. Like international law, ministerial ethical judgments must get force and power from public opinion and not from "armed forces." A suggestive value is all that we may claim for our codification.

However, against the belief that many of the points of ministerial etiquette are unimportant trifles, we should like to quote Bishop Ames of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Bishop had been addressing preachers on the importance of the "little ways of gentleness that endear preachers to people," and concluded: "Although these things may not come up to the dignity of minor morals, I submit to you that this is one of the cases where it does well to tithe mint and anise and cumen. If by attention to these things

we can make ourselves more useful, it is well worth while to attend to them. Of course a minister does not forfeit his soul because he does not know how to enter and leave a parlor; he has not committed a mortal sin because he cannot make a graceful bow; he has not offended against the Holy Ghost because he always wears a somber countenance instead of a smiling face. But if these things have so much to do with our success as ministers of Christ, I submit to you if our text (Rom. 16: 1–15) teaches no other lesson but that of courtesy, it is well worth our learning."

Of late it has been shown that there is need for a more comprehensive outline of ministerial ethics. At least four brief codes have been brought out and adopted by ministerial bodies. We shall place these codes foremost among our references and cite them at many points throughout this work. It was the attempt of the writer to catch together in this book all suggestions, thoughts, and directions which might be obtained from the writings or expressed judgments of ministers bearing on the points at issue. We have endeavored to give the most space to the most debatable questions, and while attempting to make the work comprehensive have tried to omit the trite and dismiss with a bare mention the obvious. We have had to draw upon the general Christian consciousness for many sanctions where we were not able to cite the mind of another. It was of course impossible to cover all relationships, nor do we feel that all have been correctly classified by chapter and division, as this was an arbitrary matter. Above all, the author wishes it understood that in no way does he set himself up as an *arbiter elegantiarum*, but simply as one who is glad to

assemble the thoughts of many ministers, weld them together in the heat of the Christian consciousness, and let it go as a work of brotherly love. Our references follow.

. . . . . .

As our general reference throughout this work we reprint the separate items of the codes of ministerial ethics which have appeared to date. Since these were adopted by ministerial bodies more or less large, they have therefore a greater weight than the judgment of an individual minister. In our scheme we print the items of these codes throughout the work at those points where each item applies to the question at issue. The complete codes will be found printed in the appendix to this volume.

The *Congregational Code*, cited item by item hereafter, was adopted by the New Haven (Conn.) Association of Congregational Ministers. It is found reprinted in its entirety on pages 24-27 of "Church Administration" by William H. Leach.

The *Methodist Code*—as we call it—cited herein is said to have been adopted by a conference of Methodist ministers at Rockford, Ill., in 1926. Its reprint is taken from the *Christian Century* of December 16, 1926. This code is almost identical with the *Congregational Code*, wording and phraseology being the same except in one or two items. We make no judgment as to priority between these codes. This code was printed with no numbered sections.

The *Presbyterian Code* we take from its reprint as given in an article by William H. Leach in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* of July, 1927. This code is said to have been adopted by the Presbytery of New

York. Dr. Leach holds that it is based on the earlier ethical codes shown in this volume, and we have not therefore printed its separate items throughout our work except the one or two which make distinctive contributions beyond the other codes.

The *Unitarian Code* is said to have received denominational sanction. It is to be found printed in the August, 1926, number of *Church Management.* "It was drafted by Charles R. Joy, of Dedham, Mass., and was adopted with few dissenting votes by the Unitarian Ministerial Union."

Two compositions on this subject have also been cited by us for more or less general treatment of the theme. They are: "Ministerial Ethics," an article by Rev. S. Z. Batten, D.D., of the American Baptist Publication Society, published in the *Journal of the American Society of Political and Social Sciences* in May, 1922; and "Ministerial Ethics," an address by Bishop Charles Betts Galloway, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, delivered before the School of Theology of Boston University, February 26, 1894, and printed in "Great Men and Great Movements" by the Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Reference has also been made to the following works for many points involved in ministerial ethics and etiquette: "The Technique of a Minister," Rev. Bernard C. Clausen, D.D.; "The Christian Pastor and the Working Church," Rev. Washington Gladden, D.D.; "The Minister and His Parish," Rev. Henry Wilder Foote, D.D.; "The Minister's Everyday Life," Rev. Lloyd C. Douglas, D.D.; "Church Administration," Rev. William H. Leach, D.D.; "Lamps, Pitch-

ers, and Trumpets," Rev. E. Paxton Hood; "Yale Lectures on Preaching," Rev. Henry Ward Beecher; "Homiletics," Rev. Daniel P. Kidder; "The Christian Pastorate," Rev. Daniel P. Kidder; "Homiletics and Pastoral Theology," Rev. William G. T. Shedd; "The Worshiping Congregation," Rev. Lucius C. Clark, D.D.; "That the Ministry Be Not Blamed," Rev. John A. Hutton, D.D.; "The Minister as Shepherd," Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D.D.; "In Pulpit and Parish," Rev. Nathaniel J. Burton, D.D., "The Making of a Minister," Rev. Charles R. Brown, D.D.; "The Way of a Preacher," Rev. John A. Kern, D.D.; "The Ministry to the Congregation," Rev. John A. Kern, D.D.; "The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons," Rev. John A. Broadus, D.D.; "The Building of the Church," Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D.D.; "The Book of Weddings," Mrs. Burton Kingsland; "The Rites and Ritual of Episcopal Methodism," Rev. Nolan B. Harmon, Jr.

In addition to the above several articles appearing in *Church Management*, a magazine edited by Rev. William H. Leach, have been of material assistance. A recent series on points of ministerial procedure, written by Rev. James Elmer Russell, D.D., of Binghamton, N. Y., has been especially valuable.

N. B. H., Jr.

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	The Profession	17
II.	The Man	33
III.	The Citizen	51
IV.	The Brother Minister	66
V.	The Pastor	85
VI.	The Church	109
VII.	Public Worship	128
VIII.	Occasional Services	147
	Index	177

CHAPTER I

THE PROFESSION

By common consent the Christian ministry is esteemed the noblest of the professions. Some may object to this classification, and some may wish it qualified by affirming that by the Christian ministry is meant a real ministry and not a counterfeit one. General consent, however, does give to the ministry primacy among the noble callings. If this much be accorded by persons other than the minister, he himself ought certainly to hold his profession in as high regard as does the world. Many ministers believe it to be higher in kind as well as degree, but they never press this upon others. They take the recognition of their "high calling" not as a mark of personal honor to themselves, but as an honor to That One who first called them. Like the Apostle, the best minister strives to apprehend that for which he was himself apprehended.

The Christian minister, therefore, will always uphold the nobility of his profession. There are certain broad aspects of ministerial life, certain temptations and even pitfalls which must be observed by him. It is our purpose in this chapter to outline some of these larger problems that affect the ministry as a profession before we go on to discuss in succeeding chapters many minor points of ministerial procedure. Our main thesis has been outlined above and shall be adhered to throughout this entire writing: The Christian ministry is and

ought to be where popular thought is inclined to put it—the highest form of professional service.

. . . . . .

With this as an introduction we lay down our first general professional rule: *The minister must keep the nobility of his calling uppermost in his own mind.* Should he fail to do this, he had better take up some other form of work. If for any cause he begins to look down upon his profession, or feel that for him its glory has departed, he is lost. The temptation may come to him, for instance, to measure the ministry by some of the standards which apply to the work of other professions—by temporal influence, by cultural values, by that ubiquitous and omnipresent measure of all things in our day and time—money. But should he attempt to use any of these things as a measure for his work, failure will come to him. The Christian ministry can no more be measured by these values than time may be measured by the mile or space by the pound. The professional standards of the ministry belong to another category, a spiritual one, nevertheless a very real one. Any effort to force a comparison with other professions will fail. The Christian minister must know this. He who commiserates his profession in his own mind or who doubts its value is in a bad way. Let the story of Sir Launcelot and the lions be recalled. When, as Tennyson gives it to us, the beasts uprose and grasped the knight each by a shoulder, a voice came saying:

> Doubt not, go forward; if thou doubt, the beasts
> Will tear thee piecemeal.

So the man who doubts in his own mind the mission

and work of his own calling, is in a fair way to be torn piecemeal between the twin lions of hopelessness and despair. But he who doubts not, but goes forward believing, will find the world believing with him.[1]

The next principle is: *Hold high in outward acts the established reputation of the Christian ministry.* There is a popular esteem in which the ministry is held, a popular regard, estimation, and measure, not the making of one generation but of all generations. It is entirely possible for some one minister to lower or injure this popular estimation. When this happens, a man's excuse may be that prevalent conceptions as to ministerial rights and privileges are wrong, and therefore he is engaged in an attempt to set them right. Or he may say that new occasions teach new duties, etc., but every minister should weigh very carefully his own thought and intent against the practice of the ages. Just as no reputable lawyer ever breaks the traditions of his ancient and honorable calling, just as no physician departs from but holds in the highest respect his own professional ethics and methods, so the ministry should preserve and guard those traits which by a common consent belong to the highest type of ministerial service.

It will be impossible here to outline the various ways in which ministers may lower the popular estimation in which their profession is held, but that it can be lowered all know. Perhaps ministers should have some such custom as prevails among army officers. There is an offense for which military officers are sometimes court-martialed known as "conduct unbecoming an

[1] "The minister should never speak disparagingly of his Church or his profession." (*Unitarian Code*, I, 6.)

officer and a gentleman." What this conduct is cannot beforehand be specified—each case is brought to trial upon its own merits. Sometimes it is for one thing, sometimes for another, occasionally even for unprecedented breaches in official bearing. On all such occasions the officers themselves act as the judges of this vague, intangible, but all-embracing law. Cannot the same standard be applied to the conduct of ministers; for there are acts which are unbecoming a minister as well as those unbecoming a gentleman?

For instance, in the name of "pulpit freedom" some ministers have become publicity seekers. The minister who thus breaks a thousand years of pulpit tradition (and this can be done in a thousand ways) may receive "two sticks" notice in all the papers and be flattered as one "free from ancient shackles," but it is the part of wisdom to await the final fruits of this man's life and act. We do not plead for a narrow-grooved ministry, nor for conformity to traditionalism as such, but we have our suspicions of the brother who is so anxious to show himself "free" that he wears the clothes of a clown in order that he may not be taken for a "gentleman of the cloth," or who turns his pulpit into a vaudeville stage to show that no bondage of pulpit formality is binding on *him*. Such men more often than not give the impression that they are lovers of publicity more than lovers of God. Care should be taken by each minister that his public and private conduct be not unbecoming to the best traditions of his profession.

The story is told that a minister once decided that he would go upon the grounds of a certain university in Pennsylvania, a university whose charter, as is well

known, prohibits any minister of the gospel from setting foot upon its grounds. The minister in question disguised himself and achieved his object—he got in. But here is the point: he had to sail under false colors to do it, and ministers everywhere, universally, refuse to forswear their calling for a moment. On the contrary they are proud of their profession, nor is there any special regret among them because they are forbidden to visit the university in question. No gentleman ever cares to go where not wanted.

Conduct unbecoming a gentleman is always conduct unbecoming a minister, but conduct sometimes not unbecoming in other gentlemen may be unbecoming in the minister. Dr. Henry Wilder Foote well says in his "The Minister and His Parish" that the community expects a closer adherence to moral standards on the part of the minister than from the ordinary man; that there are "courses of conduct which, while all right for others, are unbecoming in him." This is true and must be noted here in our discussion. A different ethical sense governs the minister from that which the ordinary gentleman recognizes. A minister may rebel, and with good logic too, at the implications of this statement. He may affirm that he has a perfect right to do what any other Christian has the right to do—and theoretically he has. *Practically*, however, he is going to find, as Dr. Lloyd C. Douglas expressed it, that the people will make a priest out of him whether he likes it or not. He will discover that he is bound not only by the law of the gentleman, but by something more. We might call this by various names, but we have a perfect warrant for affixing the Scriptural term *expediency* to this

principle which, while not always binding upon others, must always be considered by him. Saint Paul expressed this apropos of his own Christian right: "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient." (1 Cor. 6: 12.) We need not push into the Apostle's deeper meaning here, but we will suggest that the successful pastor is going to learn that while certain customs, habits, manners, and viewpoints of his own may be logical, sane, and correct, it will not always be expedient for him to thrust them forward as such. We do not mean that principles must be toned down, or that expediency itself may not sometimes be made an excuse for moral cowardice and compromise, but it is true that things which for the man may be lawful, may not be for the minister expedient.

For instance, the writer knew of a minister who was a great smoker of tobacco. After service one Sunday evening he walked home with one of his leading men. As the pair approached the house the layman turned to his pastor and said: "Brother N—, if you will not be offended at my request, I am going to ask that you do not let my boys see you smoking. They admire you very much and I do not wish them to be influenced by your example and, while they are young, learn the use of tobacco." Now the pastor might have entered upon a strong argument in defense of his right to smoke, and perhaps proved his case. He might have gone into a dissertation upon tobacco as something lawful if lawfully used. As a matter of fact he said nothing, but did as he was asked. He threw away his cigar and "quit" from then on. He said later that if he had any habit which prevented him from throwing

the best sort of influence over the young men of his church, that habit was wrong—and his statement, we say, was right.

So with many points of conduct. It is perfectly lawful for a minister to associate himself with a social group which has nothing in common with his own flock—but the time will come when he will find that it was not so expedient. It is perhaps lawful for the minister to tell the loudest and best of all his jokes at the Sunday dinner table when he is "company" somewhere—but when that man again stands in his pulpit and reads the "watch and be sober" phrases which were written, not at a Roman banquet but in the lurid glow of persecution throwing its shadows against an eternal background, he is going to find that it was not expedient. A great many practices may be defended on the score of lawfulness which must be rejected on the ground of expediency. Dr. Foote had it right—whether we like it or not, the people demand a higher standard from the minister than from the ordinary man.

Another inflexible rule of professional conduct may here be stated: *The minister may never for reasons of personal safety desert his parish and people when some great, universal danger impends*, such as a hostile invasion, a virulent epidemic, or natural disaster. This situation happily seldom ever arises—has arisen only a few times in our own land—but the unanimous voice of the ministers of all the ages has declared that the pastor may not leave his people and fly to safety when the people themselves are in some epochal danger. His own family he may send to safety or protect when he can, but for himself there must be faithfulness unto

death. It is in times of natural disaster, floods, epidemics, earthquakes, bloodshed, that the pastor may prove a tower of strength to his flock. If the captain of the ship is the last man to step into the lifeboat; if the engineer, grimy with soot, makes it his first consideration to save the train, let what will happen to the locomotive, surely ministers of Christ can stay at their posts during times that try their people's souls, giving comfort and help and rescue.

This question we remember to have been discussed at great length in Possidius's "Life of Saint Augustine." It seems that the barbarians were laying waste all North Africa and were advancing to besiege Hippo. The ministers with others were deserting the churches and fleeing before them. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, was asked by many priests what course they should pursue. They were not cowards, but doubted the wisdom of remaining and giving their lives for a problematical good. Many persons had fled, though some refused to leave. Augustine, the great church father, sat down and wrote a letter about it. It is solid Latin (and Augustine could write some of the meanest Latin ever composed by mortal man) and the writer once had to stumble through it, but out of the uncouth language of a bygone age a mighty spirit and a great man makes himself entirely clear. It is not right, said Augustine, to close the churches; it is not right for the shepherd to flee when the flock is to be left—the priest of God must stay at his post. To-day the universal voice of the Christian ministry says he was right.[2]

[2] It may be interesting to know that on the occasion of the visit of Cardinal Mercier of Belgium to Princeton University some little

The proper utilization of his time is another matter affecting the minister. Like other professions, the ministry is not a matter of eight working hours with pay-and-a-half for overtime, but of life service. The minister therefore gives himself completely to his profession. Of course this does not preclude days off, vacation periods, etc., which belong to all professional men; but the minister feels that his profession demands his all. To engage for a certain part of his time in other remunerative work would, he believes, break into the usefulness of his calling. He would consider it a lowering of the legal profession should he learn that a certain lawyer acted as night watchman during part of his time; or a letting down of the medical profession if he found that a physician in off hours acted as bookkeeper for a manufacturing concern. Not that these other occupations are not eminently worthy and fully as estimable as are the professions mentioned above if engaged in honorably, as they should be—but professional men universally hold that their profession demands their all.[3]

The ministry is often tempted to depart from this professional rule. Salaries are low and in some places

---

time after the World War, this letter of St. Augustine was, if I recall rightly, transcribed and presented to him by Dean A. F. West of the Graduate College of Princeton. It was felt that Cardinal Mercier, too, was a Bishop who had not left his post in time of invasion.

[3] "As a professional man the minister should make his service primary and the remuneration secondary. His efficiency, however, demands that he should receive a salary adequate to the work he is expected to do and commensurate with the scale of living in that parish which he serves." (*Congregational Code*, II, 2. The *Methodist Code* is practically identical.)

it becomes almost a necessity for the minister to help "make the pot boil" by engaging in other occupations. This is bad—bad for the man, bad for the calling, and bad for the people. Where there is any other choice this should not be done. We are aware, however, of the hard but unanswerable fact that sometimes it must be done. But consequences take no thought of excuses. The preacher who is compelled to buy and sell on the side, or to teach school for a remuneration, will find that his ministerial standing suffers, no matter how good may be the reasons which impel him to divide his work. The minister will do well to avoid any work outside his own professional labor. In case he must engage in other remunerative work, however, he should have a clear understanding about this matter with the officials of his local church.[4]

Using the ministerial or priestly position to get financial gain for one's self has long been known as *Simony*. This of course has always been despised by the true men of the ministry. However, the man who measures every bit of professional service by its monetary equivalent, or who thinks in terms of money, is not far removed from the one who would sell spiritual gifts for silver or gold.[5]

There is, however, a subtle form of ministerial danger in which not a few have become involved in

[4] "He should be conscientious in giving full time and strength to the work of his Church, engaging in avocations and other occupations in such a way and to such a degree as not to infringe unduly upon that work unless some definite arrangement for part-time service is made with the Church." (*Unitarian Code*, I, 2.)

[5] "The minister should always place service above profit, avoiding the suspicion of an inordinate love of money, and never measuring his work by his salary." (*Unitarian Code*, I, 1.)

recent years—namely, using the pastoral position or ministerial standing as a means toward influencing the financial transactions of others, notably one's church members. Sometimes the minister himself goes into financial dealings for private gain. Some have bought and sold stock in certain concerns or have promoted and sold stock among their own members. In some cases it is in real estate that these transactions take place, and ministers, after going in themselves, draw their people in. Such proceedings hardly ever result in financial profit and never result in spiritual gain. Sometimes the loss is both financial and spiritual and church and ministry both suffer. This temptation is usually brought to the minister by some interested person and the popular pastor is often sought out and invited to "get in" a promising transaction. He is perhaps allowed a liberal premium or given a large block of the first shares of the new company. His influence is recognized and his name will lend sanctity, though not always salvation, to the speculation. But let the minister beware. If trustful people under the care of their pastor follow him and get hurt in a financial undertaking, that man will have to face a terrible judgment at the bar of his own conscience. The business of the minister is to lead people along spiritual lines, not to aid them or even himself in making money. Let the minister shun all such invitations. He had better believe that all worth-while stock has already been taken by shrewd business men, or investigate why the very attractive offer that is presented to him has not been taken up before by some bank or financial concern. Let him hold it as an axiom that all good real estate, new subdivisions, etc., that are promising

have been financed by good business men long ago, and as for oil stock, there is no good oil stock left—certainly none for a preacher.

The *Literary Digest* of November 23, 1915, contained a discussion of this question by no less a person than Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis. According to the report presented there, Dr. Hillis had engaged in timber speculations which had turned out badly for himself, and, it is intimated, for some of his friends. Dr. Hillis is reported as having confessed the whole matter to his congregation publicly and asked forbearance. He is then quoted as saying:

> For years I have had a growing conviction that a minister has no right to make money, and does his best work without it. . . . At best the longest life is short, all too short for the noblest of tasks, that of the Christian minister. Great is the influence of the law and medicine; wonderful is the task of the jurist and statesman; marvelous the power of the press; great also the opportunity of the merchant and manufacturer who feed and clothe the people; but nothing can be higher than the call to shepherd Christ's poor and weak, and happy the minister who has never interpreted his ministry in terms of intellect alone, or has never secularized his sacred calling, and who at the end of his life is able to say: Behold these are the sheep thou gavest me, and not one of them is lost.

These words should be taken to heart by every minister. Other writers whose books we have studied agree in general with this pronouncement. Let all temptation to make money "on the side" be eschewed. The minister's meat is to do the Father's will. Let him remember that in the division of land to the twelve tribes, as narrated in the Old Testament, the Levites got no share of land for a possession. "The Lord" was to be their inheritance. "The Lord spake

unto Aaron, Thou shalt have no inheritance in their land. . . . *I* am thy part and thine inheritance among the children of Israel." (Num. 18: 20.)

The minister's name is valuable, he will find. Men and women of prominence, among them ministers, have often had cause to regret the fact that they permitted their names to be used on the letter-head of this, that, or the other supposedly charitable or benevolent organization. Quite often the purpose and methods of these hastily organized associations are commendable, but other things, unsavory agents, or questionable advertising methods, sometimes make the minister or public man wish he had never heard of that particular organization. People of prominence are usually drawn into giving their names for use in such work by being assured that the name is all that they need give—no details of the work will fall on them. This is true: the name is all that is wanted—but how valuable that is! The minister should make it a rule never to give his name to any organization or movement to which he cannot at the same time give himself, and within limits his attention. This will force him to know what he is getting into, and will give him a chance to have a voice in the work.[6]

In this connection we should like to insert the story told of General Robert E. Lee. After the Civil War ended he was of course penniless, but his fame had gone far and wide. The story goes that he was sought by a certain powerful financial concern which was or-

[6] "A minister should be scrupulously careful in giving indorsements to agencies or individuals unless he has a thorough knowledge and approval of their work, lest such indorsements be used to influence others unduly." (*Presbyterian Code*, III, 6.)

ganizing an insurance company and wished to *have his name* as the president of the concern. It was explained that the ex-commander would have no actual duties at all, although a princely salary would be given him; that what the company really wanted was his name. General Lee heard the men through and then said simply: "Gentlemen, I have nothing left but my name, and that is not for sale." And so he ended it.

Encroaching upon the field of another profession should be mentioned here as another unethical procedure for the minister. Fortunately there is little danger of anything of this sort becoming widespread.

There have been a few instances in which the minister attempted to prescribe for his people's physical ills. However, even in the few cases where the D.D. is also an M.D., let medical ethics be observed, if not ministerial, and the case left to the attending physician. Any criticism of a doctor's treatment of a patient should not be indulged in by a minister. Some have made trouble for themselves by acting as self-constituted doctors or nurses. Of course in emergencies where medical attention of a simple sort is required, the minister, like any other man, will apply first aid and do what he can.

The minister should not lower his profession by becoming a "handy-man" for all the members of his church. We knew of one pastor who was kind enough to assist certain families a few times with the use of his automobile. It soon became the usual thing for the people to call for him whenever some one had to be taken to the hospital in the near-by city or visit the dentist there. Sometimes he was telephoned and asked to meet a daughter as she was coming in on a

night train and it was "inconvenient" for any of her family to meet her. Now "I serve" is the minister's motto, and no matter how humble the task, the minister ought to be willing to do it for the Master's sake; but the pastor who thus becomes a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for his people will not only find himself endlessly taxed along this line, but his own standing as a proclaimer of gospel truth will become obscured. Where there is need, of course, work must be done, no matter how menial; but the people should learn that there is a higher duty devolving upon the minister than to act as errand boy for the community.

Last, but not least, the minister should hold his professional service in such esteem that he will keep it from being dissipated in the maze of shallow channels of service which open out in all directions to-day. He is visited, for instance, by a person who wishes to arrange for a lyceum program to be given in the community and for the school children. The minister is asked to take the lead in this and "put it over." It is argued that the lyceum will bring an enlarged vision to the community and to the children; it will teach new lessons, inculcate new ideals, and lay a wonderful foundation for spiritual growth; it will be a magnificent opportunity for the minister to show himself public-spirited and at the same time help along his own work. Will he not therefore accept the responsibility for the success of the lyceum?

All of the above is true, for the sake of argument, but why not ask the minister to teach school? That, too, is a good work, noble work. Why not ask him to sell good books or distribute high-class magazines? These will build up knowledge among his people.

Why not ask him to go out and stand all night with the policeman and see that the law is properly respected and enforced? That is a vastly important work. In short, why not ask him to do any and every good job that is to be done in his town or community? Why not? Simply because he is not called to any of these things, noble as they are. He is called to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ Jesus, and anything less than this cometh of evil. Not that he cannot and should not become all things to all men, for he can, and at times must lead in certain undertakings. Not that he should not be a supporter of the lyceum and the school and the policeman as any other good citizen. But let the minister recognize and show forth for all time and eternity, by his every word and act, that the place he occupies and the position he fills are unique in a peculiar way. He has a field all his own. No one can compete with him in his own field nor may he compete with others without loss to himself. Let him know that and show that. Let him write it on his mind and heart. Let him eschew all sidetracks that lead off the main highway. Let him confine all his energies to his own great mission—and he shall be rewarded by doing well that peculiar work to which we trust the Lord his God has called him.[7]

---

[7]We do not mean to give the impression that the minister should seek to avoid doing his share of the volunteer public and social service work which will better his community. By virtue of his training and talents he has a higher obligation along this line than has the ordinary citizen. What we do mean is that he should not permit his own distinctive work to be hurt by his attention to these other matters. It is a case where the good may be the enemy of the best.

CHAPTER II

THE MAN

A REMARKABLE characteristic distinguishes the Christian ministry from every other profession. This characteristic was perhaps best stated in an address given by President Woodrow Wilson to a band of Christian workers and ministers in New York upon one occasion. The President, declaring the thought and teaching of his own father along this line, said that the Christian minister must *be* something before he can *do* anything. That is, his character and person are greater than his work. It does not matter, for instance, what sort of character a lawyer may have—the jury looks at the facts and the evidence he brings out in each particular case; it does not matter what sort of man a doctor is if he is a "good doctor." But the minister as a person stands above his work, his sermon, his all. His preaching is measured by what the people know of the man; his work is tested by the character he shows. He may have the tongue of a Demosthenes and the executive ability of a Richelieu; but if he is not personally known to be a good servant of Jesus Christ, neither oratory nor ability will avail.

This is a vastly important conception for every minister to have. President Wilson was right—the old Presbyterian preacher of Staunton had got to the bottom of things. After a minister is what God will have him be, he will forthwith do what God would have him do.

So every preacher stands on the shoulders of the

man he really is. He lives among his people, he has public and private meetings with them, and his life comes to be known and read of all. For him there is no awesome seclusion to heighten the sense of his dignity. He has no control over mystic or awe-inspiring symbols, as had the priests of other times. The people see the man himself standing clear of all the wrappings of ministerial cloth. Wherefore it has come to be that by so much as his character is known, by that much is his strength measured—for good or ill. Because the people know the man, they listen to the preacher; because they see him as a neighbor, they respect him as pastor. What he does speaks louder than what he says. As expressed before, primarily he must *be* something.

The man therefore, who is the minister, has certain duties to himself and to his person. There are obligations he owes to himself and to his own manhood, and these it is our purpose to observe and catalogue in this chapter. Some of these duties are obvious and may be dismissed with a bare mention; others are matters that require a brief discussion.

. . . . . .

Physical Life.—Proper care of the body is a prime duty for every person. The minister will preach only as long as his physical body is a functioning organism in this world. He will only preach well, or serve well, when his body, the physical nexus of his soul and the universe, functions well. Thought along this line is too trite to follow, nor may we go into a discussion as to ways and means of "keeping fit," with side notes on "How to prevent preacher's sore throat," or "Why ministers break down at fifty," or

any of the matters involved in this question. That the minister owes some time and thought to his body is conceded by all, but the pity is that the minister will recognize the common sense of this statement, agree to the entire list of obligations which he owes himself in the line of recreation and exercise, and then straightway go and forget what manner of man he is. Too many ignore the whole physical basis of life and reap as a result collapse in middle age.[1]

Rest and Recreation.—Every minister holds himself ready to spend and be spent. In extraordinary emergencies he will go without sleep or rest—not to mention recreation. Nevertheless it is the prevailing opinion among ministers that it is well to set aside deliberately a certain definite time for rest and recreation in connection with the ordinary routine of ministerial life and labor. One day a week he may reasonably plan to use for his own relaxation and rest, as other professional men and workers should also do. Sunday is the preacher's working day; therefore some other day must be his day of rest. With many ministers this is Monday, though some feel that Saturday is a good day to be chosen. Dr. James Elmer Russell hints that Saturday afternoon and Monday morning might well compose the ministerial *Sabbatismos.* Dr. Jefferson is said to have regarded Saturday as a better rest day than Monday. This is a matter for individual

[1] "It is the minister's duty to keep himself in as good physical condition as possible." (*Unitarian Code*, I, 4.)

"It is equally the minister's duty to keep physically fit. A weekly holiday and an annual vacation should be taken and used for rest and improvement." (*Congregational Code*, I, 3. *Methodist* and *Presbyterian Codes* identical.)

choice as is the method of finding relaxation or pleasure on the day itself. This much, however, ought to be said: The recreation should be entirely unlike the routine work of the week, or it will not serve as recreation. If mental labor is a man's life work, then let him beware of spending his rest day in writing articles, even though this be an agreeable pastime to him. The golf links, the broad highway, the deep pools where the trout are supposed to lie (with the accent on the *supposed*), the work bench in the cellar —at any place or in any way that suits him the minister should rejoice in the liberty in which God gives him a chance to be free one day in seven.

The Monday morning preacher's meeting ought to be conducted in line with this ideal and be a place for relaxation and good fellowship rather than a continuation of the regimen that has bound the minister all the week. Too much formality, or the heavy educational courses often tried by local ministerial associations, sometimes destroy the spirit of freedom that should prevail. Ministers like to talk to each other, and are profoundly interested in each other. To that extent they enjoy very much getting together. This should be the object of their meeting on their day of rest, we believe. Of course there may be need for definite group action by ministerial associations, and it will sometimes be necessary to make a business session out of the minister's meeting. As a rule, however, such business sessions ought to be called for that definite object and purpose and not take up the rest hour of the members. The minister's day of rest should be his own. It will not always be so, of course, for funerals, deaths, sickness, or other duties that

cannot be put off will press in upon his rest day—but sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.[2]

Vacations.—Is it right to take a vacation once a year? The older ministers at one time agreed that it was not. Their argument was that the devil never took a holiday, so why should the minister? A pen-and-ink picture came out in one of the church periodicals years ago which showed an old woman who had evidently walked a long way to come to the church on Sunday morning. She was shown facing a closed church door and a placard on it: "No Preaching—Pastor Gone on His Vacation." That was the view of the past, but the school of thought that presented that argument has passed away—perhaps because of living up to it too closely. It is recognized now that "there is that scattereth, and yet increaseth." Ministers everywhere now hold that vacation is not an attempt to flee duty, but to be all the more ready for duty. Just as the Master's "Come apart and rest awhile" called his own away that they might refit themselves for service amid the "still dews of quietness" and "calm of hills above," so his modern disciples feel that for them too there should be occasional periods of calm in which they may "rest awhile."[3]

Dr. James Elmer Russell holds that a vacation of

---

[2] Bishop Warren A. Candler, of the M. E. Church, South, whose wit is proverbial, was once asked if he were going to attend the Monday morning preachers' meeting. "No," the Bishop is said to have replied; "when I joined the Church I promised to give up *worldly amusements!*"

[3] "A weekly holiday and an annual vacation should be taken and used for rest and improvement." (*Congregational Code*, I, 3. *Methodist* and *Presbyterian Codes* identical.)

less than four weeks is not enough for the minister. "It takes about two weeks really to relax after a strenuous year, and then two weeks more are needed to build up. It is better as a rule to take the weeks of one's vacation together. In this way they have a cumulative power."

A vacation ought to be a vacation. Like the day of rest, it should find no obligation binding on the vacationer except such as may be absolutely necessary. His work especially should be pushed from his mind. When he goes elsewhere—and it is scarcely a vacation unless one can get away from his own church and neighborhood—he had better avoid preaching in other pulpits and places. This is neither ethics nor etiquette, but plain common sense.

Mental Life.—The improvement of the mind and the corresponding improvement of professional and spiritual powers by application and study must be upheld here as another primary ministerial duty. Long ago Shedd said that the holiest men have been the most studious. Even John Wesley, who was so jealous of his own time and that of his preachers, laid down the strictest injunctions as to the duty of studying and reading, and no minister worthy of the name can afford to fail or become slovenly in this matter.

The artist has a "studio," the business man an "office"; the pastor should have a "study." Indeed, since early days that room in which the minister lives or is supposed to live with his books has been known by the title just given—"The Study." To-day, since the preacher is largely a business manager, his study might be termed an "office," but let us hold to the old name and old ideal of his work. Certainly every

minister owes himself a place for his distinctive mental labor.

Concerning books, magazines, etc., no special comment is needed here. The duty of the ministry to keep abreast of the times and to cultivate the mind is everywhere recognized. "The more we work on the soil, the less we have to work on the crop; the more we work on the preacher, the less we have to work on the sermon," commented Dr. James Elmer Russell.[4]

The chief faults to be guarded against along this line are: Too much study, or bookishness, resulting from being out of touch with life and its realities; or too little study, a temptation of this age now that the minister is expected to be more of a social engineer than a student, more a "bringer of things to pass" than one who understands things that have passed or "things that must shortly be done." The guard against either of these faults is obvious. Let the student give himself more to executive and pastoral work, and let the ecclesiastical engineer take more time for the reading of books and the study of the ages.

Time and system should regulate study as well as everything else. The morning hours are usually considered best for mental application and brain work.

Most ministers buy and accumulate too many books.

---

[4] "The minister should count it a most important part of his work to keep in touch with the best religious thought of the day, and should make it a point of honor to set aside sufficient time for reading and study." (*Unitarian Code*, I, 3.)

"Part of the minister's service as the leader of his people is to reserve sufficient time for serious study, in order thoroughly to apprehend his message, keep abreast of current thought, and develop his intellectual and spiritual abilities." (*Congregational Code*, I, 2. *Presbyterian* and *Methodist Codes* identical.)

The old fallacy still prevails with us—that when one buys a book he automatically appropriates its contents. *Quod non sequitur*—not at all. However, most ministers confess to loving books for themselves; and although old friends on the shelves may be shabby, and in the nature of things useless and unnoticed, it is strange how hard it is to part with one of them. This strange propensity, however, is one for the ministers' wives to puzzle over, and we let it pass. A "working library" is the ideal of the most efficient preachers and pastors.

Spiritual Life and Duty.—Not much need be said here. It is a fact, however, that ministers' are often like the character in the Song of Solomon—they have kept the vineyard of others, but their own vineyard they have not kept. The Bible becomes a textbook, not a reservoir for personal spiritual refreshment. Prayer becomes a something done for others, not for personal needs. The lives of the saints and the stories of Baxter, Bunyan, and the Fathers furnish sermonic material for the mind, not heart-throbs of which life should be made, and we become—God forgive us—professional. The quiet hour, prayer, that rigid discipline which we should like to impose on others, should be enterprised by ourselves. Very trite, very true—but how many fail?

Duties to Family and Home.—Among the primary duties and near the top of the list come those which the minister owes to his own home and family. This is universally conceded, but often we have seen the minister's home immolated upon the altar of his work. The pastor has a hard task, but the pastor's family has often a harder one. Of course circumstances again must be taken into account in judging the

relation of a minister's home obligations to his public and professional duties. There are times when an emergency in the home demands every thought of the father or husband—there are times when an emergency in the church becomes so imperative that it takes precedence over all home duties. This will be admitted. What is not so easily remembered, however, is that a minister's relationship to his family is as high and as sacred as that to his Church.

Happily there is usually no conflict here, but on the contrary a most beautiful interlocking of work and duties. The better the father, the better the pastor; the better the guide for the children of others, the better the guide for one's own children. Conflicts of course occur, and of two possibilities along this line we wish to speak.

The minister owes it to his family to make a living for them. No one else can. He stands responsible for this. His family must look to him and to him alone for food and clothing. "If I can't make a living for my wife in the ministry, I will resign and work where I can," we heard a minister once say, and applaud the statement. We have no idea that the minister in question was thinking of a luxurious living, nor of life in terms of money. What he meant was that if he should ever be faced with the stark fact of a wife and children who needed food and raiment and he could not supply these so long as he served as pastor, in that hard case the obligation of husband and father would supersede temporarily the obligation as pastor and preacher. There are many pastorates and many church members, but only one home. Many look to the minister as spiritual father, but only a definite few—and these

few exceeding precious to him—look to him as an earthly father. Neither the minister nor his family measures life in terms of the monthly pay check signed by the church treasurer; but no father, minister or otherwise, can forget those who look to him for daily bread. It might be added that while a minister may not be able to give his family the so-called "finest things" in life, yet he can and should labor to make a comfortable, happy home for his children. The record of the ministers of the nation along this line is a proud one. The high percentage of successful men who have come from homes of ministers speaks not only of necessities supplied, but of industry, frugality, and a stimulating mental and spiritual atmosphere about the parsonage, rectory, or manse. It is a noteworthy fact that there are more sons of ministers in "Who's Who" than of any other profession.

The family of the minister should not be made to serve as slaves of the church, nor should their home be used as a public convenience for the entire membership. "Don't let ministerial life and domestic life get mixed," Dr. Lloyd C. Douglas counsels in his interesting book, "The Minister's Everyday Life." The minister's family, like that of any other in the congregation, ought to take an active part in the work of the Church and its several departments. However, to force the wife into the position of assistant pastor, and the children into becoming prodigies of childish ecclesiastical leadership, is wrong. It is not fair to the family and it spoils the church. When the next minister comes along his wife may be an invalid, or have a new baby, or be incapable of outside leadership, and it will count heavily against her if the con-

gregation should get the idea that a preacher's wife should be a combination Sunday school teacher, social service worker, playground director, junior-church superintendent, and sick nurse. Let the minister's wife be the queen of the home—not the handmaiden of the congregation. "He for God only, she for God through him," would be a Miltonian quotation that might fit here.

All things being equal, the family of the minister should have the same rights and privileges, duties and obligations that belong to other Christian families. Of course it is recognized that the family in the parsonage should be a model family—but so should every home circle be. The reputation which ministers' children bear either for good or ill is usually not of their own making. They are credited as being better than the ordinary run of children until it is found that they are not; then they are credited as being much worse than they really are. But wisdom, we presume, is justified of all her children—including those of ministers.

The writer knew a case where a minister was sent to serve a parish in a small mill town. The whistle blew early in the morning calling the factory hands up and to work. The minister in question took the position that his family should be no whit behind the other families in the town, and that since his church people had to rise before daybreak, his own family must do the same in order to "set a good example" to the people. Of course there was no special need for such an early start in the parsonage, and the early rising was done merely for the sake of appearances. Did the man in question do well to drive his own home in that way? We do not believe that he did.

Financial Matters.—There is a duty which the minister owes to himself, to his family, to his profession, and to his church—to be absolutely exact on money matters. "Financial looseness or irregularity cannot be tolerated," as Dr. Washington Gladden well says. All the preaching a man may do will not atone for unpaid bills. He may have what is to him a good excuse, but in the eyes of the world there is no excuse for failure to pay debts. God will forgive sin, but the world will never forgive unpaid bills.

In this connection something may be added as to extravagance, or incurring debts without the strong probability of paying them. Every man may make mistakes along this line, but the minister should be very careful whenever he incurs any obligation that will be for him an unusually heavy one. The Methodist Episcopal Churches have long made a point of this matter, and whenever candidates for admission to the Methodist "traveling connection" come before the bar of the Conference for examination they are asked the definite question: "Are you in debt so as to embarrass you in your ministry?"[5]

---

[5] The author once heard the question put this way: "Are you in debt so as to embarrass you?"

"No."

"Are you in debt so as to embarrass *the other fellow?* . . . I have seen some men," the Bishop said as the laughter subsided, "who were in no way embarrassed by their debts, but their creditors were very much so."

"The minister should set a high moral standard of speech and conduct. He should be scrupulous in the prompt payment of bills, and careful in the incurring of financial obligations." (*Unitarian Code*, I, 5.)

"As an ethical leader in the community, it is incumbent on the

Ministerial Discount, Etc.—Formerly a great many things were given to the minister, and even to-day in stores where he is known he is frequently granted a liberal discount. Some ministers take the position that these special favors mitigate against their work and effectiveness. They argue that these discounts and gratuities destroy self-respect, and that people have a tendency to count upon them as relieving them of deeper spiritual obligations. The minister sometimes adds that he would much rather have a fair wage paid him and no favors given; he could then buy what he wanted and be a man among men rather than count upon or be supported by gratuities which are but thinly disguised charity. "Do away with all this," say many ministers; "let the people give us a salary commensurate with our position, and we shall neither ask nor accept favors from anyone."

The trend of ministerial thought of late years has been in this direction. It is certainly in advance of the old-fashioned idea that the preacher must be given something every time he comes around, or that he ought to help himself by doing his own "foraging." At the same time the spirit in which these things are done will govern to a large extent the minister's judgment in such matters. The writer knew a physician who never presented a bill to any minister whom he attended (very few physicians ever do, for that matter). A certain minister came along, however, who insisted that he be allowed to pay as any other patient. The physician in question was not

---

minister to be scrupulously honest, avoid debts, and meet his bills promptly." (*Congregational Code*, I, 6. *Methodist* and *Presbyterian Codes* identical.)

only a good but a level-headed man. He told the minister gently that he was not showing a favor to him personally, but to the calling which he represented. He added that no personal equation entered into this at all; that the ministry was able to serve the Master in ways he could not; that this was one of the avenues of service that God permitted him—and it was his pleasure thus to serve. This will represent the other side of a debatable question. When a favor is granted as a mark of respect and honor to the profession, the individual minister usually takes it as such and not as a private matter. The minister is, after all, the recipient of favors, even gratuities, because he *is* a minister. He can change all this—he probably will before long; but if he does not watch, something priceless will go along with it. When "tit for tat, you give me this, I give you that" becomes the philosophy of the men who are in our pulpits, we shall doubtless have a more independent ministry, but at the same time a more independent people. God help a church whose pastor is independent of the people and the people independent of the pastor.

On the other hand, where the minister knows that he will be the recipient of a special favor—as, for instance, that the doctor will not make a charge for a professional call—the self-respecting minister is apt to go without the medical service which another man would instantly summon. When a storekeeper sells us something at cost because we are the minister, we hesitate to go there and seem to be seeking a favor. This is one strong argument against the practice of receiving gratuities and discounts.

Again some ministers may presume on the minis-

terial discount, on the free medical attention. One such minister can do more harm than all the men who quietly go to other stores rather than appear where they know they will be given a discount. But it is a sad fact that because ministers are given considerations often which other men do not receive, some of them unconsciously get into the attitude of mind which expects these considerations. Such men show their disappointments—and talk of it—when no special favor is given them, and when one is given they take it simply as a matter of course. Some have grown old in this habit of mind, and it is bad, very bad.[6]

It is a fact that some ministers have abused their privileges and brought all into disrepute. Take the case of the clergy fare. Minister after minister has commented on the fact that many times ticket agents in railroad stations show scant courtesy to the possessor of a clergy fare. They make out the ticket, but convey by some sign or act a something which some ministers have said was a studied contempt. Is this because agents feel that many ride on these fares who are not worthy of the calling?

---

[6] They are not quite as impossible as the young lady who is said to have bought some goods in a store and then asked if the firm gave a ministerial discount.

The reply was: "Yes; is your father a minister?"

"No," said the young lady.

"Your husband, or your brother?"

"No."

"Why," asked the clerk suspiciously, "do you expect ministerial discount?"

"Well, you see," replied the young lady pensively, "I expect to become engaged to a theological student when he comes home in the summer time."

The writer once stood by the ticket window in the Union Station, Washington, watching a brother minister buy a ticket on a clergy fare. Crowds were passing through the station on the way to the trains going to the Laurel races—a great sporting event. "I am not going to the races," said my friend in a jocular mood to the ticket seller; "I just want a ticket to Baltimore."

"I have already sold three clergy fares to Laurel this afternoon," answered the agent shortly.

Can things like this be the cause of the station agent's dislike to clergy fares?

Fees.—The question as to receiving fees has also proved troublesome to many minds. Like the favors mentioned above, some ministers feel that it is better to refuse fees. In the early Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America there was a measure which forbade the ministers of that Church to receive a present for administering baptism or burying the dead. However, the "wedding fee" has long been a welcome visitor in the home of all ministers and there are not many to-day who have scruples against it. Of late years the practice has grown of giving a small fee to the minister after each burial service, to take care of personal incidentals connected with his own presence, transportation, etc. Many ministers, however, steadfastly refuse to accept anything, even expenses, in such service. Dr. Lloyd C. Douglas does not accept baptismal or burial fees, as he considers his services here as part of his work. He admits that in refusing funeral fees he has an occasional embarrassing experience, but is satisfied in the long run with his rule. Dr. Douglas agrees concerning wedding fees

that these should be accepted, and should go to the minister's wife. Dr. Henry Wilder Foote has a very sensible discussion of the whole matter of fees and takes the position that these should be accepted when they come, but should not be counted upon in the mind of the minister. Ministers never accept fees from each other.[7]

Dress.—We leave the whole matter of dress, neatness, etc., to the instincts of the Christian gentleman. It might be suggested here, however, that while the injunction to let personal adornment be not outward but inward was addressed a long time ago to women of a bygone age, yet there is an unseemliness about a minister wearing much jewelry upon his person. Most of them do not have it to wear, but instances have been known where the glitter of a diamond on a brother's hand did not comport with his outward profession as a humble follower of the Meek and Lowly. Not that a moral wrong is involved; it is simply not in good taste.

Clerical Garb.—"I shall not quarrel with a preacher who employs a symbolic dress for some occasions," said Henry Ward Beecher; "but no man should dress himself simply for the purpose of saying, 'I am a

[7] "The minister recognizes himself to be the servant of the community in which he resides. Fees which are offered should be accepted only in the light of this principle." (*Congregational Code*, II, 6. *Methodist Code* identical.)

"Professional service should be gladly rendered to all without regard to compensation, except for necessary expenses incurred." (*Unitarian Code*, III, 4.)

"He should never accept from a brother minister fees for professional services, at christenings, weddings, and funerals." (*Unitarian Code*, IV, 7.)

preacher.'" But Dr. Henry Wilder Foote says that if a man's Church expects a distinctive dress, let him wear it. There has been some argument about it; but, after all, it is an inconsequential thing in principle. Dr. Foote's advice is sound.

In Public Places.—Whether he wears a distinctive garb or not, a minister cannot afford to appear at any place where his presence as a man may be a reflection upon his calling. Notorious murder trials, plays or public spectacles and the like which attract the morbid and vulgar, will be shunned by him, not so much for fear of personal moral contamination as that his presence at such might work an injury to the calling he represents.

CHAPTER III

THE CITIZEN

We now come to a vexed question—the minister's relation to civic and national affairs. He is a citizen of the State as is any other native-born man; he has and enjoys all the rights and privileges appertaining to citizenship; and yet, since he is the representative of a spiritual kingdom which, as he preaches, is not of this world, a strange dual relationship faces him. How much citizen of the world is he? How much priest of God?

It would be impossible if not wrong for the minister to refuse to face the implications of his own citizenship. He is, in fact, one of the civic leaders wherever he lives. That is to say, he, with the judge, the doctor, the school-teacher, etc., is more to the fore on the local stage than is the ordinary citizen whose vocation does not so hold him before the public. In addition to this the minister is known as one who can make a speech, and so is called upon frequently for addresses outside his own pulpit. Furthermore it is his privilege and duty to address a public audience twice every week. This itself would be enough to make him a force in the local community and more or less a leader in civic affairs.

Now comes the question: How large a part in local affairs, in national affairs, shall the minister take? If he might appear as an ordinary man, the now complicated question of his relation to public affairs would not exist. He would, as any other man, stand or fall with

his own ideas, his own crowd. But whether he wishes it or not, by virtue of his position he is not an ordinary citizen. His utterances are not only given in public—they are seized upon by both press and people as weighty words. It is true that he, with the schoolteacher, doctor, and others, stands on a local pedestal, but his words are commonly taken as of far more importance than are the utterances of these other local characters. This is because he is looked upon as an ambassador of God, and all that he may say or do in attempt to divest himself of this ministerial character and appear as an ordinary citizen, somehow fails. How, then, shall this combination man, this citizen-minister or minister-citizen, act? What things are Cæsar's and what things are God's? That is our question in this chapter.

Civic Service.—The minister, representing the Church, is often called upon for public addresses, public prayer, etc., in civic and national assemblies. Few formal secular programs are deemed complete without an invocation and sometimes a benediction by a Christian minister. Our legislative assemblies are opened with a prayer by a chaplain, and so are some courts; the government provides for chaplains with the armed forces of the nation and in such places as prisons and hospitals. The minister who is placed in such situation will find that the course of conduct governing his actions is somewhat different from the usual pulpit and parish procedure.

He should realize, first, that he is placed in public non-ecclesiastical assemblies, as, for instance, to open a public gathering with prayer, by virtue of the fact that he represents the entire Christian ministry and

not one special branch of it. Hence it is axiomatic with every minister so situated to represent as best he can the whole Christian Church. By no word or deed does he give even a faint suggestion that he may be taking advantage of the occasion for denominational purposes.

The writer has heard of no instance where a minister so placed has transgressed this unwritten rule. The usual minister is well aware of this general representative character, and so proud to be the mouthpiece of the Universal Church that he is extremely anxious to act for all the forces which he feels to be sustaining him. The chaplain of the State Senate or House, the chaplain of the prison, the chaplain of the regiment, never forgets the broadness of his service. If the truth be told, these men usually "lean over backward" in order to be impartial. Stories come to us from the last war in which Christian chaplains ministered to the dying Jewish soldier in the name of a common God, and in which Jewish rabbis held up the cross before the eyes of the dying Catholic. Under the trip-hammer of war our little denominational symbols, whether of sand or clay or stone, were alike crushed to atoms.

When a minister is called upon for any public address, as upon Thanksgiving Day, school commencement, or other occasions, he acts in accordance with the principle just set forth. Such themes as are handled are general ones, appropriate to the nature of the occasion. Needless to say, one could scarcely afford to take advantage of such a situation for any private or denominational reasons. A breach of faith here would back-fire with disastrous results.

There is only one difficulty that may arise in case a minister is invited to occupy a place in connection with a public program. It is the question as to whether his own appearance or part in such program will be in keeping with his ministerial calling. This can always be cleared by understanding beforehand the exact nature of the occasion in which he is to be involved. The presence of the minister, and especially his participation in any public event, is viewed as an indorsement of whatever transpires. The writer had occasion once to regret exceedingly his connection with a certain banquet, although he had followed the advice here given and thought himself entirely familiar with what was to take place. He therefore consented to and did ask the blessing of the Almighty on the occasion. The developments of the evening were such, however, that he felt constrained to withdraw his presence and later to disavow his part in the proceedings. Much embarrassment would have been saved himself and most assuredly the others involved had the printed program or private advices informed him fully beforehand of what was to take place. The cloth of the minister makes wonderful camouflage — and Mr. Worldly-Wiseman knows it.

The professional rule that under no circumstances may a minister forswear his ministerial nature or Christian character must be carefully observed on all public occasions. It was told about Washington City when a great international gathering, official in character, was to be inaugurated, that the minister selected to open the gathering with prayer was cautioned against making his prayer a definitely Christian one, and requested not to close with the Name of Jesus.

The story is possibly not true; but if true, what should the man in question do? We believe that it would be the consensus of thought among the Christian ministry far and wide that under the circumstances the invitation should be declined. To accept on condition that one's real status as a Christian minister be glossed over, if not abnegated, would be very unpleasing to most of the ministers of the nation. The part of manhood as well as of courage would be to say: "If I am not to appear under my true guise, I cannot appear at all."

A similar situation is said to have arisen in a certain legislative body when a question of moral import was under debate. The prayers of the chaplain of this assembly caused objection among the opponents of the moral forces. He himself was finally waited upon by a committee and asked to be less explicit in his public petitions. At the same time he was reminded that his position was a political one, that political forces could remove him as they had made him. One may imagine how a delegation of this sort would fare at the hands of an Amos or a Jeremiah, but we have no sure knowledge of what transpired in the case above mentioned. Again, it seems the part of Christian manhood to represent the Christian consciousness and that only, regardless of consequences. The minister cannot deny himself or his God. If public prayer before any audience is a ceremonial formula and that only, then why waste time—to make it no worse—in imitation of an awful act? If it be what it pretends to be, then, in God's name, there can be no trifling.

Privileges of Citizenship.—The minister has certain privileges as any other citizen. He should register and

comply with such regulations as enable him to vote. The only dispute that may be waged with this idea is brought by the man who says that politics are so rotten that the ministry should have nothing to do with them. This is sometimes heard from pious cranks on the one hand, and from political bosses, who are neither pious nor cranks, on the other. Dr. Gladden well says in discussing the secularization of the pulpit that there are two classes who cry out against it—those who hold that religion has nothing to do with the world, and those who do not want to know what Christian applications may make in this field.[1] These two classes are the only ones who object to the minister's right to the ballot, and he does well to ignore such objections and be a citizen with the other citizens of his land.

Besides the positive privileges such as the ballot, and the inalienable rights to life, property, protection, which the minister enjoys with other men, he has certain ministerial privileges recognized by the State which it may be well to mention here. These may be termed negative privileges, since they are in the nature of immunities given the ministry by the civil power.

1. The minister is always exempted from jury duty. This is an outgrowth of old English common law procedure which looked upon the *clerici* as men of mercy and not of judgment. It may be recalled that when a State trial takes place in the English House of Lords, the bishops, who are the ecclesiastical peers, always file out before a vote is taken, on the theory

[1] "The Christian Pastor and the Working Church," p. 123.

that the vote of the clergy must be for—certainly cannot be against—mercy. American practice follows English, and no minister in our land ever finds himself as talesman in a jury box.

2. The minister is not summoned to the army in time of war. During the last war certain ministers raised the point[2] that exemption from military duty was a slight upon the manhood of the ministry. Universal opinion, however, both clerical and lay, agrees that the State does well in refusing to put weapons of carnal warfare in the hands of the men of God.

3. The State will not and cannot force the ministry to any service which violates conscience. It cannot compel a minister to marry a couple if he is unwilling; it cannot compel him to testify in court concerning confessions which may have been made to him in his pastoral capacity.

It will be seen in the above that there is a recognition accorded the minister by the State which is not given to the ordinary citizen. These privileges he should recognize as belonging to the sacred nature of his office, and should accept them accordingly. In turn the minister should pay back to his State his loyalty and his service in his distinctive way.[3]

Political and Social Questions.—We now come to a critical and debatable question. What part shall the church and minister take in shaping the social and political life of the community? Shall the pastor

[2] *Literary Digest*, November 3, 1917.

[3] "The minister's reponsibility to the State is that of a citizen. He should, therefore, be faithful to his public obligations, and should respond to reasonable requests for assistance in community work." (*Unitarian Code*, V, 2.)

actively engage in any movement for social or political betterment which will entangle him with local interests and persons? Should he speak from the pulpit on such matters? Some ministers and denominations answer, "Under no circumstances"; others reply, "In case a moral issue is involved"; still others, "Yes—on all matters that affect the life of the Church and her people."

Much has been written along this line. Usually one's findings are colored by traditional views. The older, more conservative ecclesiasticisms as a rule abhor the idea of using the church or pulpit in any, to them, ephemeral political conflict. On the other hand there are modern types who decry with scorn the minister who, leaving the issues of the living present, preaches on the sins of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but never speaks against local aldermanic tyranny or judicial partiality. "If the Church is to be a Church indeed, and not a mere farce—and a peculiarly pernicious farce, a game of sentimental make-believe—she must be filled to overflowing with the fire of the ancient prophets for social righteousness, with the wrath and love of the Christ," says Studdert Kennedy in his "Wicket Gate" (p. 169). We do not know how far this particular preacher would have the Church go, but we do know that the cry to-day is for the Church to come to grips with present pressing problems, economic, social, political.

The question is one of importance and men differ much in their opinions. Some never permit their ordered and stately worship to be interrupted by anything, no matter what social or political storm may be raging among the people. Others rush quickly

into what are clearly partisan matters and thunder at local political conditions, at one party machine or the other. Quite often these advocate from the pulpit cataclysmic measures, all under the sanction of religion. When, for instance, an industrial strike is on, such ministers take sides and preach on the strike, sometimes with violence and fury. As a consequence they earn from one side high plaudits, and from the other unqualified hate. Their apology—if they give one—is the idea above set forth: The Church should be a big factor in the life of to-day. Of what use is it, say these, to ignore the present pressing matters of bread and meat, right and wrong, human shame and degradation, and preach on hypothetical questions dead and done with these many centuries? Let the Church speak and rebuke evil wherever it is. Thus she fulfills her mission and thus she makes for righteousness.

When all is said there is no absolute ruling that can be made. Conditions vary and a speech or a sermon that might be an imprudence from one man may be the fulfilling of all righteousness when it comes from another. There are times when the minister of God must speak, let the local political chips fall where they may.

We believe that the consensus of opinion among ministers of the Christian Churches will fall in line with the following broad principles or guides for conduct. We have not time to discuss fully the various sources and viewpoints from which these principles were obtained, but believe that more or less general approval will be given the following:

1. *No minister should in public speech or sermon take part in partisan politics as such.* He may and should

cast his ballot as has been said, and if he is a personality of any force at all will have a very definite opinion on the matters at issue in every partisan election. But *as a minister* or *in the pulpit* he should not pronounce upon partisan questions. This same principle will cover his procedure in all conflicts of a social and industrial sort when no moral principle is at stake.

Some ministers endeavor to excuse their participation in factional matters on the ground that they are not appearing as ministers but as men. They are citizens; therefore they are acting as citizens and not as clergymen. This is a distinction, however, that the usual person can never get through his head. If he sees the Reverend Doctor Blank speaking, then it is the Reverend Doctor Blank he sees, and all affirmations on the part of the Reverend Doctor that he is not now the Reverend Doctor, but just plain John Blank saying what he thinks—all this means nothing to the man in the street. He feels that if some one tossed a brick on top of plain John Blank that the Reverend Doctor Blank would feel it pretty keenly—and so he would.

A protest against the pastor in a partisan campaign was recently reprinted.[4] It seems that Dr. Alexander Whyte of Edinburgh had once aroused several of his prominent men by taking too active a part in the Irish question. Their protest as reprinted deals with the matter of the minister as minister and minister as man. It is rather sound, and Scotch to the core.

> We think that he (Dr. Whyte) cannot take such a part without to a greater or less extent compromising the

[4] *Church Management*, August, 1926.

> congregation; he cannot divest himself in public estimation of his representative character, or fail to do something toward clothing his personal political opinions with the authority which belongs to his office; and he has been invested with that character and office . . . for other considerations than those of secular politics. No one would think of questioning your sacred right of individual opinion and of supporting your opinion by your vote, but we venture to submit to you that many considerations . . . point to the high expediency of our minister abstaining from identifying himself in so marked a manner as you have recently done, with either side of a burning political controversy.

2. *The minister not only has the right but is obligated to speak upon purely moral questions, in the pulpit or out of it,* be the political or social implications what they may. None may say him nay here. The morals of the people, the tides of the time as these touch his people's lives, on these he is the declared authority.

But how is one to know what is a moral issue? Moral questions sometimes have political implications, and political questions sometimes have moral implications. A moral issue may be involved only in a minor way in some tempest in a municipal teapot. A needed social reform may be the least of all the planks in a political platform, and perhaps even then bears evidence of having been tacked on to "gain the church vote." The most untrustworthy persons morally may have made the greatest pledges and be the highest bidders for moral support. All these angles give one pause, and, as hinted before, the minister who permits himself to be drawn into such local issues will discover many queer political bedfellows.

In this difficulty it is a safe rule to learn the opinion

and thought of other ministers and churches upon the matter at issue. If the moral sentiment of a great ecclesiasticism, of several of them, or of the vast bulk of Christian people, declare a paramount moral issue to be locked up in a social, economic, or political campaign, then the minister usually feels that he has a right to declare his moral sense of the matter. But a minister who undertakes to decide as to the rights and wrongs of great political and social movements all by himself, or who carries on a single-handed and individual warfare, becomes a sort of ecclesiastical bushwhacker or private sniper carrying on unorganized warfare. When such a one is caught—and it is not hard to catch him—he gets the treatment meted out to snipers, and the place thereof knows him no more. This is not to say that the individual may not be right, or that the firebrand is not sometimes necessary to start the conflagration. It is to emphasize the risk of setting oneself up as judge of all morals, arbiter of all rights and wrongs. Common sense says it is better to move with the organization and to be guided by the consensus of Christian thought.

3. *When a minister speaks or preaches on burning moral questions as wound up in political or other alignments he must understand thoroughly every phase of the situation.* It should be remembered that he has constituted himself a judge, jury, and, as far as possible, an executioner. The town, the city, the nation, sitting as a higher court, is going to review his judgment. It will wish to see the evidence on which he based his decision. What are the briefs, pro and con? Has the side he adjudges wrong had a chance to present its case, if not in "open court" at least in public? What

was the defense? He has publicly found for the other side, and the world wants to know why. If a minister has based his decision on hearsay evidence, common report, or "what people say," he had best watch himself.

This brings us to mention a fault to which ministers are particularly prone. We might treat of it in other places, but it comes in here very naturally. The ministry as a class is given to uttering generalities in a way that is dangerous. No one answers the minister from the pew nor subjects his running statements to careful scrutiny. "The sermon is, by established custom, a monologue which the preacher delivers without fear of contradiction or interruption. . . . If the preacher, who is now protected by laws prohibiting any interruption of divine service, were to expect the flow of his logic to be challenged or questioned, there would be fewer weak arguments and poorly constructed sermons."[5] This is true. If the minister had to face the opposition that a lawyer knows will meet his statements in court, he would soon become much more conservative in his assertions. When the minister in preaching says that "Darwin says thus-and-so" or "Ingersoll taught this-that-or-the-other," he would be greatly nonplussed should some keen listener arise and ask him on what page of Darwin's works that statement may be found, or just where Ingersoll uttered the remark quoted. The minister who writes for publication learns this lesson—he cannot deal in generalities in writing as in speaking, for writing truly "maketh an exact man." But in speech the ordinary preacher

[5] Sermon by Bishop Charles H. Brent, published in the *Brooklyn Eagle*, April 18, 1927.

is tempted to forget this and soar away in beautiful flights of oratory to heights where he overlooks the world—and some of the facts therein contained.

Hasty generalization is a serious fault anywhere, but nowhere is it more to be condemned, or more dangerous to the minister, than in a political fight. In preaching the ordinary sermon he can "get away" with sweeping assertions; but if he undertakes to tackle the evils of the city hall crowd with a few broad accusations or tell the county what he has heard about the "courthouse gang," he had better have in reserve his indictment of specific instances. Generalization will get him nowhere here. For let him be well informed beforehand that when he undertakes to fight long-entrenched political and social evil he engages in a conflict where no quarter is asked or given. After the first gasp of surprise that comes from the persons he attacks, he is going to find the ground beginning to shake beneath his feet. No young lady in frail health is now about to tap him lightly upon the wrist with her fan. They are out to "get that preacher" by fair means or foul. Ministers naturally shrink from warfare of this sort, but sometimes it must be enterprised. When it is, the righteous forces are often surprised and comforted to find what a power Truth can be to combat evil. Although the devil fights with fire, it is marvelous how Right seems to be its own self-evidencing witness, its own champion.

In a résumé of the discussion above we should like to emphasize the ideas already expressed: Partisan or purely party questions should be left alone; but to enter a civic or national fight on the side of a moral question is not only right but obligatory upon the

minister, unless he, like Meroz, does not care to come out to the help of the Lord. One should be most certain that a moral issue is deeply involved, and to be certain of this should keep his eyes on the great righteous forces and tides of the people, not on the judgment of an isolated community. If the problem be complicated by local prejudices, personalities, old parties, ward bosses, etc., let the minister take all this into account. Then if, after all, he decides that it is his duty to "go in," let him, like Esther, put on his best apparel, theological, ecclesiastical, political, and personal, and approaching unto the most uncertain Ahasuerus of modern politics have as his motto, "If I perish, I perish." Thus recklessness and quick speaking shall be done away. But when all is said and done, it is in our opinion a greater evil to stand idly by and see right worsted and wrong triumph than perchance to emerge at length from conflict with armor battered and dinted but "valiant for truth." For such a one, as Bunyan has it in his great story, "All the trumpets will sound on the other side."

CHAPTER IV

THE BROTHER MINISTER

"Relations with professional brethren present problems in ethics and etiquette," states Dr. Henry Wilder Foote. This is certainly true. In fact, the nucleus of such ministerial ethics as have come into existence has been the relationship between the members of the profession. Some, among them Henry Ward Beecher, have felt that it was not good for ministers to associate too much with each other, nor have a "class consciousness." Dr. S. Z. Batten, in his article on "Ministerial Ethics," observed that "the professions have a tendency to flock together and view things in their own light." While this might be dangerous if carried too far, yet the growth of a great conscious brotherhood is a magnificent thing, especially when this brotherhood is composed of men who are ministers of God. Why should not this brotherhood be able to make rules for its own members? If lawyers are the sole judges as to who may be disbarred from the practice of law, and if physicians have a code governing their relations with each other, why may not ministers recognize that they, too, have a brotherhood which may well look to each of them for conformity to its ideals? At any rate when we think of ministerial ethics, we think of the relation of minister to minister, and the few codes and addresses which have appeared

to date upon this subject deal largely with this phase of the question.[1]

Duty to Predecessor.—Always there is a predecessor, and always his successor owes much to him. "Much of our work is to reap where others have sown," said Bishop Charles B. Galloway of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (Address on Ministerial Ethics, Boston University, 1894): "Their sowing should have equal honor with our reaping. A circuit, station, or district may be served the full term without the earnest pastor's noting much fruit of his labor. Another comes whose mission is to gather the golden sheaves and whose joy it is to sing the harvest song. Though possibly much honored, credited with being a more successful workman, he really enjoys the fruit of another's planting. . . . He that planteth and he that watereth are one."

Most ministers agree that the best plan of work when one first comes into a charge is to study the predecessor's methods and plans and continue them as best one can. In the beginning there should be no radical break with his methods. Indeed, Bishop Galloway, in the address referred to above, made this

---

[1] "As members of the same profession and brothers in the service of a common Master, the relation between ministers should be one of frankness and coöperation." (*Congregational Code*, III, 5. *Presbyterian Code* identical. The *Methodist Code* is identical except the last line, where it has, "of frankness, of comradeship, and of coöperation.")

"It is his duty to show a friendly and coöperative interest in his brethren, attending the group meetings of the ministers, assisting his brother ministers with labors of love, defending them against injustice, and following them with kindly concern in their hours of need or distress." (*Unitarian Code*, IV, 6.)

injunction quite strong. "He (the minister) should endeavor to carry out his predecessor's well-formed plans. . . . A wise master builder must leave many proposed works uncompleted. They require time for their full development. . . . Here is the vulnerable heel of Achilles in our itinerancy. Nothing is more common than for a pastor's cherished enterprises to lose or lapse when he moves to another field. His successor doubts their wisdom, considers others more important, and, with a self-conceit that would be ludicrous if the results were not serious, haughtily declares: 'I have my own plans; another's I never could follow.'"

At any rate, local self-government and customs ought never to be harshly jarred upon a new man's arrival. The new minister needs all the popularity he can gather the first few weeks. It will do no good, but actual harm, to inaugurate at once sweeping changes in order to let the people know that a new hand is at the helm. In a few weeks, when conditions are better known, when the "well-formed" plans, as Bishop Galloway had it, are known from the "ill-formed" which belonged to the former régime, the new pastor can then get into his own stride and guide his people into the best of everything.

It seems the part of modesty as well as of tact to refrain from telling a great deal of personal history, opinions, methods, etc., on one's first appearance in a new work. Let the people find out their pastor for themselves. Facts for the benefit of local papers may be given, of course, with photographs, but before the congregation it is best to take charge quietly and proceed to work. "Let not him that girdeth on his

harness boast himself as he that putteth it off," would be an Old Testament proverb which will fit here. Furthermore, there are always the curious who are out to look the new man over on his first appearance, and who, when they know all about him, will lapse into their usual state of religious desuetude. It will not hurt to keep this crowd guessing—and coming—a little longer, before they resume their natural positions.

A Predecessor's Friends.—Every pastor has a group of his own special friends. There are some people in every pastorate who will never feel toward a present pastor as kindly as they do to a certain former one. They hold him in memory as the best minister their church ever had. They will speak of his excellencies to each succeeding pastor and sigh with regret at his passing from their midst. They may be polite enough to add as an afterthought that of course they like their present pastor also—but that same present pastor well knows that he will never take the beloved predecessor's place in the hearts of certain individuals. It is well to be very kindly and sympathetic with these, and to remember the lover's advice and "praise a rival." Never for one moment should a minister permit himself to be irked by the ceaseless praise of a former pastor as that is dinned in his ears by devoted friends. If it be done purposely to worry one, as in some cases, it is answered best by appearing not to notice it; if it be done naturally, it should be just as naturally entered into. "Depreciation of a predecessor's efficiency ought to be as rare as it is reprehensible," said Bishop Galloway.

A minister is sometimes fretted by the tactless persons who delight to inform him that Brother Jones,

the former pastor, never did as he is doing. One is powerfully tempted to tell these officious persons that they should behold and see that the present pastor is not now Brother Jones. The new school-teacher can thus deal with a roomful of pupils, but the preacher had better not: "Men have different plans," or "We are going to try this and see how it works"—such replies will usually assure good will at least from these persons.

Every minister discovers some persons who dislike the former pastor. "Every man of positive convictions will have had some antagonisms. His style was not according to every taste. Some oversensitive souls felt themselves slighted. On his first pastoral round a preacher will discover that his predecessor had a blade that cut and a twanging bow that sent an arrow to the mark. He will hear criticisms favorable and unfavorable. Then and there he has an opportunity to display the true chivalrous brotherhood of the ministry."[2] Bishop Galloway states further what every preacher knows: That such persons "who so freely discuss his predecessor will give him a similar introduction to his successor." This is true. Yet it may be the part of wisdom to take advantage of any revived interest these may show when the new pastor appears, but under no circumstances should he let these hear a single word to the discredit of his predecessor. A criticism of a former minister given to this type of person will go much farther than if told to others. They will be glad to pass it on as ministerial approval of their lukewarmness or antipathy.[3]

[2] Galloway's Address, p. 272.

[3] "It is unethical for a minister to speak ill of the character or

Visit of Former Pastor.—When a former pastor returns for a visit to his erstwhile parish, it is of course the duty of the incumbent minister to call upon him at the earliest opportunity as a mark of courtesy. If he has returned to perform a marriage ceremony or conduct a funeral, the local pastor will of course take the charitable position that the visitor was invited to come for such a duty and could scarcely refuse. Former pastors often feel that they must return when invited for such occasions, and the local man should understand that no intrusion is intended.

If the contingency arises in which the visits of a predecessor are not casual or disinterested, trouble may be made. There is nothing that worries a minister more than for a former pastor to meddle with the affairs of his pastorate. This is a breach of etiquette on the part of the predecessor, of course, and will be dealt with later, but from the point of view of the local pastor what is the proper course to take? The best method is to attempt to find out what motive actuates the interfering brother. If this be earnest though ill-considered interest, it will not be hard to show him that his letters or his visits are not best for the work; if it be a natural desire or inclination to

---

work of another minister, especially of his predecessor or successor. It is the duty of a minister, however, in flagrant cases of unethical conduct, to bring the matter before the proper body." (*Congregational Code*, III, 4. *Presbyterian* and *Methodist Codes* identical.)

"He should always speak with good will of another minister, especially of the minister who has preceded him in a parish. It may be his duty, however, to bring to the attention of the responsible officials of the fellowship any instances of gross professional or personal misconduct that may injure the good name of the ministry." (*Unitarian Code*, IV, 4.)

meddle, then, hints failing, it may be necessary for the pastor to be perfectly frank with the interferer and let him know in plain words that he is no longer in charge.

Duty to a Successor.—When a new minister comes to a parish taking up duties and obligations with which he is not at all familiar, he instinctively turns to the man who can advise and help him more than any other —the outgoing pastor. He realizes that the new field holds the usual problems having to do with the interrelation of personalities; the usual civic and public questions; the usual plans, half-done, all-done, or un-done. The outgoing minister is familiar with all such and furthermore knows of many hidden though important matters that the incoming man should be aware of. The rocks that line the ministerial channel are known to him, but not to his successor. The unanimous voice of ministers everywhere therefore asserts that it is a prime duty of every outgoing pastor to meet with and advise the new man of local conditions.

He should be ready to give a broad survey of the field and its work. If time permits, details may be discussed. If the chance offers of going over the entire roll of the church with the incoming man, he will thus be enabled to gain an insight into conditions that will be of inestimable service to him. All this and other helpful information to his successor, every minister feels himself obligated to supply, but at the same time he should be on guard lest he seem to be directing future work. One may well advise and state methods previously followed, but the minister of tact will know

how to make it clear that the situation is now entirely in the hands of the new man.[4]

Some of the older men of the ministry have remarked that it is not wise for the outgoing minister to tell the new man everything he may know concerning the people of the church. If there are hidden rocks in the channel, the new pilot should be apprised of them; but there are dark, unfathomed caves in the pastoral deep, which, discovered accidentally by one pastor, need never be known to another. What a new minister does not know does not always hurt him. Let every man find out some things for himself. A new pastor's ignorance will give him a good start toward solving many problems. He will be able blissfully and ignorantly to drive a coach and four through many a tangled knot composed of unregenerate personalities and general "cussedness" simply because he does not know what his predecessor knows and everybody knows he doesn't know. The new preacher should be told much, but not everything. Give the people a chance as well as the preacher.

Every minister should give his successor a good "send-off" with the people. "The character of the introduction and commendation which he gives will determine the welcome his successor receives and will have a potent influence upon the entire history of his pastorate. If doubts are expressed as to his ability or availability, if fears are intimated that he lacks at certain vital points, or has some objectionable peculi-

[4] "The minister should be very generous in responding to reasonable requests for assistance from his brother minister and his denominational officials, remembering that he is one of a larger fellowship." (*Unitarian Code*, IV, 5.)

arities, if confidential predictions of failure are made 'just to one or two very special and discreet friends,' the brother comes with a mountain of prejudice to scale and silent but positive opposition to conquer. On the contrary, if he commends his virtues, applauds his abilities, tells of his fidelity, rejoices in his successes, and congratulates his old flock that they are to be under such competent and consecrated pastoral care, he comes with hearts to welcome him, spiritual sympathy to sustain him, and assured victory to cheer him."[5] Even when a retiring minister finds himself in the position of a discredited or rejected man, he should be Christianly disposed toward his successor. Just as every child deserves the right to be well born, so every minister deserves the right to a good start in any new field he may enter.

It is usually conceded that in general it is better for a retiring minister to leave both church and parish before the new man comes to take charge. A former pastor's presence should not be allowed to serve as the nucleus for the crystallizing regret of his many friends. It is also best for the outgoing man to dodge the opening reception if there be one. The king is dead—let him stay dead (or out of sight). Long live the king!

Church property, church records, especially the house which is to be occupied by the new minister, should all be turned over to him in good condition. This he has a right to expect. The Methodist Code, which is one of our references in this work, makes a point of this. Dr. Lloyd C. Douglas gives minute

[5] Bishop Galloway.

directions as to just how thoroughly the parsonage must be cleaned for the new man—first with the broom, then with a mop, and then over everything again with a silk handkerchief![6]

Above all, when a man leaves a charge, let him leave it. No minister should be constantly going back to gossip with the brethren or hear comments on the work of his successor. Great harm has been done in this way by some ministers. The outgoing pastor should get all his supplies, trunks, boxes, barrels, the piano, the typewriter, the bread box, the garden hose, and Willie's shotgun—everything loaded at one time, should give all a good-by, making it as tearful as desired, but having started the truck, look not back! Although his successor may not admit it, the presence of the former pastor after that will be embarrassing to the new man. "Get out and stay out" is the injunction here.

The writer was once amused at the way Bishop Warren A. Candler of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, delivered himself upon this. He was lecturing a class of young ministers and referred to the question which they were soon to answer: "Will you go where you are sent and that gladly and willingly?" Bishop Candler said he should like to make this: "Will you go where you are sent and *stay away from where you've been?* Now John Wesley didn't put that last part in," he added, "but if he had known what I know he would have."

---

[6] "It is unethical for a minister, on leaving a charge, to leave the parsonage property in other than first-class condition, with all dirt, rubbish, etc., removed. Common courtesy to his successor demands the observance of the golden rule." (*Methodist Code.*)

The difficult question may arise as to how to proceed when an old parishioner, or an especially friendly family, may ask a former pastor to return and officiate at the wedding of a daughter of the house, or to conduct the funeral of some loved one. Such matters can usually be arranged best through the local pastor, if the family involved will take him into their confidence. He will be glad to transmit the invitation to the desired minister and the latter in turn to respond. Unless the local pastor is an extremely touchy and jealous individual, he will be agreeable to any wishes the family may have; if not, let his confusion be upon his own head. At any rate, the parishioners should proceed through their own pastor. If he does not actually transmit the invitation, he should be aware of it. This is a courtesy due him, and the invited minister must know it if the people do not.

Sometimes the people do not understand this matter as well as do ministers. Perhaps they shrink from informing their present pastor that they prefer another minister to perform a daughter's marriage ceremony. He "might be hurt" if he is not asked to officiate. Perhaps they do not care for their pastor and do not see how it is any of his business whom they ask. So they go over the head of the local man and ask a ministerial service from their beloved former pastor—and this puts the beloved former pastor in an embarrassing position. He cannot accept without offending his brother minister; he cannot decline without offending the family or friend.

Under these circumstances ministers of experience have stated that they write a tactful communication to the persons who thus request their services, ex-

pressing pleasure at the invitation, but mentioning that as a matter of form it would be well to consult the local pastor; that he no doubt will be agreeable to their plans, but as a courtesy that ministers usually pay one another this is due him. It may be tactfully added also that the present pastor should be given some part in the ceremony if possible.

Such a message generally gets the right results. When the actual occasion is at hand, if no provision has been made to recognize the local minister in the ceremonies, the minister in charge need feel no hesitancy in suggesting it. Thus all brotherliness shall be fulfilled.

Bishop Galloway felt that it was "positively reprehensible for an ex-pastor to take advantage of his personal attachments to secure the honor of officiating at marriages in his former charges." This may be admitted if the ex-pastor be the instigator of an invitation in a conscious way, but where it comes to him unasked and unsought he may be excused. His procedure in such a case has been outlined. The above authority (Galloway) also felt it wrong to hold on to a former pastorate through correspondence. "I would also advise against confidential and voluminous correspondence with old parishioners. It invites petty criticism and encourages reliance upon other counsel and leadership."

In spite of all this, it ought to be said that the breaking of the pastoral tie is no light matter. Especially with an itinerant ministry, what friends these have are usually to be found in their own pastorates. Often the minister and his family make friends and form connections which transcend the pastoral tie

and which only death may dissolve. For such friends the home of the minister is always open and to these he pours out his soul. For them he discards the outward wrappings which surround his calling and shows them himself. And to the mutual glory of the minister and his friends be it said that more often than not these persons who know the minister best as a man follow him closest as a servant of God. It would give much pain and add nothing special to the glory of the church were such ties to be severed when the minister moves. If he be tactful, he will know how to continue as friend and yet cease to be pastor.

Invitations to Other Churches.—When a minister is invited by a group or society of another church to bring some message upon a public occasion, or perhaps to occupy the pulpit in the absence of the pastor, he should always make sure that the invitation is known and approved by the preacher in charge. Some church organizations take it upon themselves to form their own programs without respect to the minister of the church. This may never bring any complications; but when an outside minister receives an invitation from such an organization, he ought, before accepting, to make sure that the minister of the church to be visited is informed of his coming. The pastor in charge may wish to be present on the occasion in question and officially welcome the visitor, as he should if convenient. A pastor might be very properly indignant should he find that another minister has been in his church or parish in an official and representative way and he himself not aware of it. He might be blamed by some for not being present to welcome the guest of the occasion. So in all cases

such invitations had better be "developed" somewhat before accepting them, and the suggestion tactfully advanced that the local pastor ought to know and signify approval before an outsider can whole-heartedly accept.[7]

This ethical procedure on the part of an outside minister holds with respect to supplying another's pulpit even when that is legally controlled by the congregation or some committee. When there is perfect good will between pastor and pulpit-supply committee, this matter never becomes acute, and, when the pastor is absent, for instance, he is glad to have his pulpit supplied by whomever his people choose. But in case a minister is invited whose disagreement with the pastor is known unto all, his presence can be construed in no other way than as a reflection upon the pastor of the church. If the people object to their pastor, let them get rid of him in a constitutional manner; until they do, he *is* their pastor and must be treated as such.

Call upon New Minister.—When a person moves into a new community immemorial custom demands that

[7] "It is unethical for a minister to interfere directly or indirectly with the parish work of another minister." (*Congregational Code*, III, 1. *Presbyterian* and *Methodist Codes* identical.)

"Ministerial service should not be rendered to the members of another parish without consulting the minister of that parish or by invitation from him." (*Methodist Code.*)

"Ministerial service should not be rendered to the members of another parish without consulting the minister of that parish." (*Congregational Code*, III, 2.)

"It is unethical for a minister to render professional service within the parish of another minister, or occupy another minister's pulpit, without the consent of that minister, whenever obtainable, and this consent should be given readily." (*Unitarian Code*, IV, 1.)

the first visit should be made by the local people. This is a courtesy that every pastor should remember with regard to "new ministers" who move in to take the pastorate of a sister denomination or any visiting minister whose presence touches the life of the local people. Such visitors and new pastors have the right to expect this courtesy from the local ministry. It is well for them, for any minister, to stand upon his dignity in this for the sake of the church he represents. Some settled pastors have a tendency to be careless as to this point of etiquette, but it ought to be scrupulously observed. As soon as the new pastor of the sister church has unpacked, or the visiting preacher has been in town a day or so, go to see him.

Duty to Ministers of Other Denominations.—Fortunately interchurch rivalry has been dying down of late years, and the sterner denominationalism of fifty years ago has been swept away. Nevertheless between local churches, especially in small towns, there is considerable counting of noses, comparing of local efforts, and striving for local prestige. This is not all bad, for the "one-church" town, like the "one-horse" town, which it usually is, is rather a spiritless proposition. Nevertheless, any rivalry between churches or ministers which begins to wear away the "tie that binds" is bad. There is room for all, and the harvest is as plenteous as it ever was. Every Christian minister has a right to the laudable ambition to reach out and gather all he may for his Master without interfering in any way with the garnering that is being done by his brother. "Our field is the world and not some other church," said Bishop Galloway; "our mission is to feed, not to steal sheep."

Proselytizing the members of other churches is universally condemned by ministers of all denominations. This is absolute.[8]

Occasionally a member of one church seeks of his own volition to join another. He may have married a member of the church he desires to join, he may feel more at home there, he may have taken a dislike to his own pastor and wishes to injure him seriously by leaving his pastoral care. At any rate he comes and asks to be allowed to join the other fellowship. What about it?

In all cases of this sort it seems the part of manliness as well as of courtesy for the pastor to whom the applicant comes to confer with the pastor who is to be left. If the facts are clear, the other minister can be trusted to release the member, and if denominational law permits perhaps give him a certificate of transfer. At any rate it is not ethical to receive a member of another Church without informing his previous pastor of the action contemplated, and the best results are secured by a personal interview between pastors.

Ministers usually feel free to receive members of other churches when these come of their own accord after they have followed the procedure outlined above. But as Bishop Galloway said (p. 282): "Sacred Church ties ought not to be severed except for the most solemn considerations of duty. And the only office

---

[8] "Especially should he be careful to avoid the charge of proselytizing." (*Congregational Code*, III, 1. *Methodist* and *Presbyterian Codes* practically identical.)

"He should be very careful not to proselytize among the members of another Church." (*Unitarian Code*, IV, 2.)

of the pastor whose communion is sought is to instruct the inquirer, but never to unsettle faith nor encourage the coming. In my own pastoral experience I have in several instances advised the applicant to remain in his own church home." Ministers will do well to learn just why the new member wishes to come in. "Spite members," like spite marriages, do not last. Because a man was "hurt" by a former pastor is not an especially good reason for accepting his membership.

Homes of Other Denominations.—There are homes in every community that are "spheres of influence" of certain churches. The entire home circle may not be members of that church, but from tradition or inclination the family is counted as belonging to a certain denomination. Ministers of other churches should respect such denominational ties. Unchurched homes are, of course, fair campaigning ground for all; but where the nominal allegiance of a family is to one church this should be remembered by the workers of other denominations.

Every minister will at times have occasion to visit in the homes of the members of other denominations—sometimes social calls, sometimes business, sometimes sympathetic, as, for instance, after a death. Most ministers stumble into the wrong homes at times, and in small places each minister is often thrown in contact with the members of other churches. In all this, however, the earnest, straightforward minister never offends nor attempts to usurp a rightful pastor's place. His brother ministers have him sized up after a brief observation of his work. Their measure is not made

by the letter of the law, but by the spirit of it. They allow him a great many liberties with their people when he earns their confidence, but if he be a "sheep stealer" the gates of brotherhood are soon barred against him.

Local Rivalry.—In small places conflicts sometimes occur between denominations and churches in such things as times for special programs, meetings, etc. Many of these conflicts may be eliminated by a local ministers' conference or by mutual acquaintance with the program of every other church. In small places an unusual or well-advertised program at one church becomes a town affair and draws from the other churches. Each congregation is, of course, anxious to keep its own crowd, and the minister is human enough to feel that he must at least hold his own. There may grow to be rivalry in securing speakers, and celebrities, and when this once starts it goes a long way before it stops. Fortunately the great mass of preachers coöperate in local work and avoid anything which would cause jealousy. Where a conflict in special programs occurs, an explanation is usually given by the one responsible. So much for inter-denominational law which, like international law, must enforce itself by the sanction of public opinion.

It ought to be said, however, that one minister whose zeal and enthusiasm are greater than his judgment can upset a whole ring of local churches. If he and his church, his picture, and his opinions are in every paper, while the band wagon crowd follows him and the town tells what a live wire he is, it may stir the ecclesiastical dust and cobwebs out of the other

churches,[9] but we have seen it stir a good many other things also—including a sullen hostility. There are greater things than publicity and energy in the world. We believe the good opinion of other ministers is worth more in the long run than the plaudits of the band wagon crowd. Reality, at any rate, has a strange way of manifesting itself, and when a man is found to be genuine, whatever be his methods, his brethren neither fear him nor are jealous of him—they rejoice with him, for he is one of them.

[9]Throughout this work we have endeavored to capitalize the word "Church" when referring to the denominational or general idea of it, but used a lower-case letter when referring to a church or parish in a local sense.

CHAPTER V

THE PASTOR

"He gave some to be pastors." The Apostle, the Prophet, and the Evangelist may outrank the Pastor ecclesiastically, but the triumph remains in the hands of the man who goes in and out among his people, visiting the sick, binding up the broken-hearted, living the Life. Wherefore it has come to be observed in our own era, as in the long history of the Christian Church, that the pastor is able to take the control of things out of the hands of either prophet or evangelist if ever there be need—as there never should be. The grade of a man as pastor will make up most of the ministerial average when final records are in. "Two-thirds pastoral ability and one-third preaching" was an old-fashioned measure of ministerial ability. That, however, was before the day of the social engineering that now counts so heavily in that final average. At any rate, to be a successful minister of God a man must be primarily a pastor, and this thing is both known and understood.

It is no part of this work to set forth a complete treatise upon "pastorating." Masterly works have appeared giving an outline of duties and a program of life advantageously used by many pastors to-day. What we wish to do in this chapter is to take up a few relationships which face the minister as pastor, especially those which have puzzling points of ethical procedure wound up in them.

Pastoral Calling.—Dr. Bernard Clausen says that, next to knowing how to conduct the sacred offices of the Church, the young ministers with whom he has talked have always wished to know how properly to make a pastoral call. Now this is indeed a good question and touches a vital matter. Calling upon people of diverse occupations, sexes, states of health, manner of life, etc., is a difficult task, and ministers have a tendency to shrink from the labor involved in it. It is not so much the time or physical effort required, but the tension, the constant outpouring of nervous energy, the studied effort to size up the situation in every home and treat it accordingly—all this is wearing on the men of the ministry. To a certain extent the old-fashioned pastoral call has been discarded to-day. Churches are large and it is manifestly impossible in some places for one pastor to cover the entire membership. Furthermore, the multiplication of other duties falling upon the pastor has cut heavily into the time that he might otherwise give to visiting. Committees, group meetings, bulletins, and kindred agencies to-day give a pastor a chance to "get at" his people in certain intimate ways that the old-time preacher never dreamed of. However, it is well for pastors everywhere to remember that their presence in an individual's home brings them in far more intimate contact with him than any amount of letter-writing or committee work can possibly do. It cannot be said too often that "the world does not want *things;* it wants *persons.*"

Practically all ministers agree that pastoral calling ought to be done as much as possible. Dr. Bernard

Clausen[1] says that it would be impossible for him to call upon his large membership, but that he makes it a point to visit all his sick. It will be understood, of course, that visiting the sick in a church as large as that of Dr. Clausen is itself a comprehensive and time-taking task. The above authority further declares that a pastoral call should not be made at all unless made well, and that is so. Slovenly calling and effortless conversation are worse than useless.

Henry Ward Beecher set forth in his "Yale Lectures on Preaching" the old-fashioned view of pastoral calling. He compared it to seeding a field: "If you visit, that plows them; then preach, as you have your furrows already open; then harrow them and in due time we may hope to see the results." Daniel P. Kidder in his "Christian Pastorate," a work also belonging to the last century, went further than this and said that the pastor should attempt to know personally every member in his church. That was a very high ideal and an impossible one for a large church, but the old proverb may well be remembered: "A house-going preacher makes a church-going people." There are, of course, preferred places upon the visiting list, for the sick and aged, strangers and shut-ins take precedence over the ordinary run of the congregation. Furthermore, there are duties that must be attended to regardless of what houses are left unvisited, but the minister who is wise will visit all he can.

Kind of Call.—Should a pastor make a "professional" or a "social" call? A professional call has the disadvantage of becoming perfunctory or stereotyped,

[1] "The Technique of a Minister."

and is apt to produce the impression that since it is a minister's business to talk this way, therefore this is the way he talks. A social call, on the other hand, while more attractive to people generally and perhaps easier on the minister, always makes the pastor wonder if he is really spending time wisely. Could he not have cultivated friendly relations with this home in some other way than by spending these many minutes in chit-chat, and so conserved time for more valuable work? Ministers revolt from the "court-fool" idea of pastoral visiting—that they are a superior type of entertainer, to tell the latest news or interpret the local or national situation for those too lazy to read.

Here again the case is in equity, and to an extent each call will demand its own special treatment. Dr. Gladden advises that the pastoral call should be social, but that religious conversation should not be avoided.[2] Dr. Clausen, as stated, makes no calls except upon the sick, and these he makes as a minister and always has prayer. It seems, however, that since pastoral calling is a part of a minister's work, he need be under no more fear of becoming professional in making a call than in preaching a sermon. Sincerity obviates professionalism anywhere. When he comes into a home he is welcomed in as pastor, nor may he divest himself of that character with anything like ease. Everything is therefore in favor of his acting naturally as the spiritual adviser of the home. Prayer when conditions permit should be the rule, but many times and in many homes it will not be advisable. Conditions of course govern cases.

---

[2] "The Christian Pastor and the Working Church," p. 200.

It will be impossible to outline or describe the different situations in which a minister finds himself as a pastor paying a call. One general rule might, however, be suggested as a guide in this difficult matter. *It should be the aim of the pastor to make himself a part of the home while he calls, but at the same time to guard his own essential character.*

That is to say, adaptation to each home and its atmosphere will give a man at once an open path to the hearts of his people. To feel that they "have known him always" is a high compliment which some ministers are able to wrest from a family upon their first call. This means that they have instantly sensed and sized up the home and its inmates and come in as one of them. At the same time the last part of the rule above cannot be too strongly insisted upon. The minister must not forego his own characteristics nor minimize the essential nature of his calling. Because poor grammar is used or because dirt is in evidence he need not break the King's English nor wear dirty linen upon his person—far otherwise. He must be himself and not let go one jot or tittle of the things which make him what he is.

To put this in other words, there should be an ease of manner and approach to the most pretentious as well as to the simplest home. This ease of bearing begets a confidence and a trust almost at once. There is no one who arouses more uncertainty and uneasiness in us than the one who is himself uneasy. A pastor who is uncertain of himself and his mission and his reception in any home, or who by an apologetic air or a hat-in-hand attitude comes nervously into a strange house will make mutual understanding very difficult.

Simplicity in all situations is a great desideratum. If one be in earnest, this is not hard to achieve. If the visiting pastor wishes to be a helpful friend to a poor family among his people, the members of that family will sense his wish by a psychological radio wave faster than the long-meter wave of NAA, and will believe in him. If he goes under the turrets of the rich with the idea that he has something for them which no one else may bring, they too will believe—these people who by their very wealth are isolated from so much of life.

The other side of this rule should now be remembered. In neither the hovel of the poor nor the palace of the rich should the pastor lose his distinctive identity in order to secure an "approach." "Adaptation without losing essential character" is the rule. If anything must be broken, it must be the adaptation. Better be unable to visit a home, better be unwelcome or disliked in a home, than to forswear ministerial characteristics and be ignored as a spiritual representative. Pastoral visiting ends when a man is not a pastor.

Partiality.—The minister is cautioned by all to avoid showing partiality to any special group, class, or faction among his members, nor should his visiting be confined to any special group or district. This needs but to be mentioned to be approved. The good pastor, like the good parent or teacher, has no favorites. He has, of course, his own special friends and congenial spirits, and he would be something else than human were this not so, but officially he is careful to hold all his people as equal and serve them equally. Certain persons, of course, need his attention more than others, but these—the sick, the aged, the dying—

are from every social class and from every part of his parish. The usual pastor finds, too, that some persons in his church need more pastoral attention than others, and he, like the Good Shepherd, often leaves the ninety and nine and goes out after the one who otherwise might be lost. This is understood. But to get the reputation of being a minister to the rich alone, or to outcasts alone, or to intellectuals alone, or to any one special group, is not good.[3]

Idle Gossip and Opinions.—Ministers should at all times be careful in the matter of light comment and idle gossip, especially regarding persons and matters of local interest, but nowhere should one's words be watched with greater care than while making a series of pastoral calls. Words thoughtlessly spoken are often remembered and given surprising interpretations after the minister has gone. It should be remembered, too, that many people read little and think less; and if their own snap judgments or prejudiced comment is thoughtlessly approved by the minister while he calls, they may be able to quote him as their authority "from then on." Another class, especially in smaller

---

[3] "It is unethical for a minister to take sides with factions in his parish." (*Congregational Code*, II, 5.)

"The minister should remember that he is pastor to all his people. He should avoid the display of preferences and the cultivation of intimacies within the parish which may be construed as evidence of partiality. He should not attach himself to any social set either in the Church or in the community. He should not allow personal feelings to interfere with the impartial nature of his ministrations." (*Unitarian Code*, III, 1.)

"In the case of parish controversy, the minister should maintain an attitude of good will to all, even when he himself is the subject of the controversy." (*Unitarian Code*, III, 2.)

cities and towns, usually finds its chief interest in local personalities and neighborhood matters. Ministers of the better sort eschew any pretense at carrying details of family or neighborhood gossip.

Successful pastors also warn their brethren against speaking in a disparaging way of any one in the local church unless done for a worthy motive and in a very guarded way. Unless it be necessary it should never be done, for promiscuous comment on church personalities is deadly. The way Mrs. Smith holds her head when she sings in church may be perfectly ridiculous, but the wise minister knows better than to make a remark to that effect. The pastor may know some very funny stories about the Joneses, but should he forget some evening in the Smith family circle and "take off" old Brother Jones's peculiar mannerisms, he may hear from it later. The story was so good, the imitation so perfect, that the Smiths pass it on with due credit for authorship (it ought to be handsomely illustrated with a woodcut of the author—nice, square, solid block of wood-cut) and then the Jones connection gets hold of it and there is a great withdrawal and coolness among the Joneses. "Unless he enjoins a fine restraint upon this indulgence of his delightful gift (humor), he may live to recall with humiliating self-abasement the occasion when he had played the buffoon and clown," says Dr. Lloyd Douglas.[4]

The Sick.—Visitation of the sick is universally conceded to be a prime pastoral duty. It is a duty which yields a rich harvest to the pastor conscientiously engaging in it. Nowhere does the minister find him-

[4] "The Minister's Everyday Life," p. 34.

self more welcome or his coming more eagerly awaited than in the sick room. "The sick are always in," as Dr. Clausen remarks, and after a time they begin to wonder why their pastor does not hurry and come around.

As sick people are not, in the nature of the case, normal, so the pastor's visit to them cannot be exactly on a par with that made to a well person. As a general rule the pastor visiting the sick should not give the impression that the situation is a very unheard-of thing, nor "make a fuss" over the patient. Of course, the facts should not be blinked—"Here is my friend or my church member, Mrs. Blank, and she is sick in bed, and I have come to see her." That is a straight-out fact which the minister wants Mrs. Blank to know he knows. But to give Mrs. Blank the impression that a terrible and unusual experience is happening to her is not good. In such situations the attitude of the M.D. can be taken on as a model by the D.D. In that splendid address to young physicians, "*Æquinimitas*," by the scholarly Dr. Osler of Baltimore some years ago, the great surgeon put in a plea for *imperturbability* on the part of the physician or surgeon. "Imperturbability means coolness and presence of mind under all circumstances, calmness amid storm, clearness of judgment in moments of peril, immobility, impassiveness, or, to use an old and expressive word, *phlegm*. . . . The physician who has the misfortune to be without it, who betrays indecision and worry, and who shows that he is flustered and flurried in ordinary emergencies, loses rapidly the confidence of his patients." If this be a good rule for *doctors medicæ*, it applies equally well to *doctors theologiæ*. A good

doctor brings calmness and a sense of security by his very presence and so should the representative of the Great Physician.

Do not stay long with the sick. A very illuminating article by James Elmer Russell, D.D.,[5] gives some sound injunctions along this line. "One should be as deliberate in entering a sick room as if he were going to stay all day, but after a few minutes, and certainly before the patient is wearied (and the very sick weary quickly), he should go."

In visiting the sick, do not sit on the bed. This is bad all around and is simply not done.

It is to be remembered that in visiting the sick the patient is the center of the stage. One is often tempted to talk to others who may be present, as this is easier to do; but the sick, like the aged, are hungry for personal attention and should be made to feel that they are more important than anyone else in the room. Centering the conversation on the sick will itself demand a short rather than a long visit.

There is an art in leaving properly, and "retreating in good order," to use a military term. This holds in the sick room as well as other places. Some pastors never master this art, and either break away with a "thank-heaven-that's-over" air, or they sit and sit and mention the fact that they are sorry, but it really is time to go, and sit some more, and finally drag themselves out as though apologizing for casting such a gloom over the room as to leave it. If it is time to go, say so and go.

In regard to prayer in the sick room, circumstances should, of course, be the guide, but the writer agrees

[5] *Church Management*, May, 1926.

with Dr. Russell in the article above quoted that it should be the rule and not the exception. Dr. Bernard Clausen says that he always offers prayer in the sick room, and so, we believe, do most ministers. There are some helpful thoughts on sick room prayer in "The Disease and Remedy of Sin" (Mackay).

Dr. Russell advises that the minister, rather than asking permission to have prayer, should himself suggest: "Let us have a word of prayer." "Patients who desire it," he adds, "will not always ask it . . . and then be disappointed if prayer is not made. A man might feel that it showed lack of courage to ask prayer simply because he is down—but would like to hear his minister ask God to bless him. Such prayers as a rule should be short."

Of course, there are prayers and prayers. Some prayers for the sick were better unsaid—that is, before the sick themselves. The writer knew of a good minister who visited an old friend who was ill and before leaving prayed for him. He informed the Lord in lugubrious tones that both of them were men living on "borrowed time," that their short and evil days in this vale of tears were fast drawing to an end, etc. The result was much depression for the sick man and much wrath on the part of relatives who had spent weeks of steady cheerful effort to persuade the invalid that he would soon be well. If a postscript were added to this story, it would be to the effect that the relatives in question saw to it that the dear ministerial brother never again got a chance to pray with his old friend. A Christian prayer ought to reflect faith and hope or there is something wrong with the pray-er.

Time to Visit Sick.—The evening before an operation

always finds a man in rather a solemn mood, especially if left in a hospital room by himself. The catharsis through which the physicians put him in order to get him ready for the knife is sometimes carried over into his mental state, and quite often he searches his own mind and considers his own life. He is not afraid exactly—the normal man we speak of—but he is glad to see company or take refuge in a strength not his own. His pastor then, if he has kept up with the state of things, has a very fine opportunity for a helpful visit.

An old godless fellow, so the story goes, was once about to be operated upon in a Baltimore hospital. He had seen much in his life and had been afraid of little, as he took all affairs philosophically; but it finally dawned on him as they wheeled him into the operating room that the situation was serious. Holding off the ether cap for an instant, he said quietly to the doctors: "Just one thing I had better say. If anything happens, I am a Confederate soldier and have never yet split the Democratic ticket." A most unusual confession and strange bill of rights with which to face God, but the thoughts of a man going on an operating table are long, long thoughts.

Another time to visit the sick is when they are about to be taken to the hospital or are leaving home in search of health. At other times regular visiting is in order—that is, calls when one is sure the sick will be at leisure to receive. Convalescence is a splendid time—as company is then much appreciated and time hangs heavily.

Hospital Amenities.—When a minister first visits a hospital, if he is not beforehand acquainted with the

authorities there, he should always take occasion to make himself known. This is especially true if one expects to pay constant visits within the walls of that particular institution. The physician in charge, his assistant, the head nurse, the internes, all should be known if constant visiting there is to be a practice. The rules of a hospital should be scrupulously regarded. Usually the minister is permitted some latitude as to hours of visiting, but he should let this permission come from the proper authorities and not take it for granted.

It is important to report to the nurse in charge of the ward at every visit. Although the office may permit one to enter and has given out the information that the man sought for is in Ward E, third corridor on the second floor, it is courteous to report to the nurse in charge of Ward E before entering. She may be dressing a patient in the ward, or for other reasons may not wish a visitor. At any rate, she is in charge and her authority should be respected. Most people forget this courtesy and the nurse is correspondingly flattered by the minister's particular knowledge of hospital amenities. She is apt to tell the convalescent patient after his pastor leaves that she likes that kind of preacher. "He knows a lot and seems to be such a good preacher." So hearts rule heads, in hospitals as well as elsewhere.

In visiting a ward it is well to speak a word to all other patients who observe the visit. This would be impossible, of course, in large wards, but in a small public ward it is not hard to do, and pleases the pastor's patient as well as the others.

Visiting Contagious Diseases.—In cities the health

authorities take charge of the matter of quarantine and have no hesitation in barring the pastor as well as anyone else. But in small places the pastor can go where he pleases and must sometimes decide as to whether his visit may not jeopardize the health of others.

As far as one's self is concerned, that is clear. Dr. Gladden quotes in this matter Van Osterzee at the Synod of Dort in 1514 as saying that they (ministers) must go to the sick being called or uncalled "inasmuch as they know that there will be need of them." Dr. Gladden agrees here; so do most ministers. Wherever needed one must go, but carrying contagion must be avoided. A minister who visits in a home where a contagious disease is raging and then forthwith goes into another home among children, would receive small thanks from the last-mentioned family. The minister's own home also ought to be taken into consideration, for to endanger his own wife or children would be just as bad as to jeopardize others. Fortunately the contagious diseases usually encountered are not dangerous, and the minister feels that he does well in waiting until the whooping cough, scarlet fever, or measles have subsided among the Jones children; then he may visit them and not spread the epidemic all over town. Of course, should great or virulent epidemics come, his service must be given freely regardless of minor considerations. Among the dreaded diseases of maturity—tuberculosis and cancer—he attempts to visit and serve as best he can, taking all possible precautions to avoid contagion.

The Dying.—When a person's days are known to be numbered the pastor should be with him all the time

possible. The conversation should be such as becometh godliness. Let faith be strengthened, let hope be in the atmosphere and trust in the prayer. It does not always pay to talk of death except *in extremis* or at the insistent will of the dying. Prayer with the dying is a very delicate ordeal and no rules can be made for it, but many ministers feel better satisfied when they have made a commendatory prayer over the departing.

Dr. Gladden discusses the ethics of informing the dying of their true condition when they are ignorant of it, and takes the position that although it is a "hard question" the responsibility of the pastor may equal that of the doctor. It is a bad business anyway, and neither pastor nor physician is eager for the privilege. Dr. Russell, whose article we have referred to, states that the doctor and not the minister should be the one to reveal the situation to the dying.

The Aged.—Next to the sick the aged have a special hold on the pastor. We need do no more than mention this fact, but let it be emphasized here that *attention* is what old people want. They wish to be noticed, they wish to be made to feel that they still are part of the world. Some pastors remember their aged members with cards or with occasional remembrances as well as short calls, and such pastors reap a hundredfold. It is not impossible that when our Lord shall call to mind the sick who were visited, the naked who were clothed, the hungry who were fed, he may also add: "I was aged, and ye noticed me; old and infirm, and ye paid attention unto me." Old people, too, are among "the least of these."

Death.—When death comes to a member or a close relative of a member, good pastors go at once to the

home affected. It may be that the minister has been at that home but a few minutes before, but let him now return. Death gives the "you will report at once" order that some of us knew in army days. Of course, quite often a minister finds that the person most affected or the one whom he calls to see does not care to receive him or anyone else, but good pastors make their presence known at the door and offer to do anything to help.

Some suggest that the matter of the funeral be tactfully taken up as soon as possible so that the pastor may plan accordingly. It would seem better, however, to let the whole matter of the funeral be managed through the undertaker or relatives. The pastor has no absolute knowledge, or at least may not openly presume, that he will be called upon to officiate. Let this matter be worked out in private by the family, and the undertaker may then inform the pastor of its wishes. The ministry is called upon to play many parts, it may be admitted, but let us leave to the undertaker his own special work. A funeral is a cataclysmic event in any home, and although it may be arranged at an inconvenient hour the pastor had best leave all other duties and give his unstinted service to those who need it most.

After the funeral the comfort of the pastor's presence is even more necessary than before. While the funeral itself is pending, an excitement, artificial it is true, but sustaining nevertheless, prevails in the bereaved home. But when all is over, when the last load of undertaker's chairs has been removed from the place, the silence of an aching void begins to bear upon human hearts. It is then that the minister of

Jesus Christ can be a true son of consolation. Let him go back as soon as possible—the next day, many ministers advise. The sorrowing wife or father or sister will wish to talk of their great trouble. Let them talk. Most ministers would agree that anything like hysteria should be checked, but wisdom now consists in letting the heart have its say. The minister's sympathetic attitude means more than words can tell. His visits may be repeated at longer and longer intervals, until Time, the great healer, does his work.

Relations with Women.—Women make up a large proportion of the minister's flock, and the pastoral relation with them is complicated by the fact that they *are* women. Two or three very good articles on this subject have recently appeared in periodicals devoted to the interests of the ministry, as "The Minister and Women," by Rev. Henry H. Barstow, D.D., of Auburn N. Y., in *Church Management* for November, 1926. For a long time there was a natural shrinking on the part of ecclesiastical writers from discussing matters that pertain to sex in connection with church work, but we live now in a day when we are anxious to see things just as they are, and when, furthermore, we have been enlightened several times by front-page headlines announcing to the world the fact that another minister has gotten into trouble.

We shall endeavor to boil down the leading thoughts and observations concerning the minister and women. We assume, of course, that every minister is morally correct, but wants to know how to avoid what may be to others the appearance of evil.

Ministers must visit women quite often in a pastoral capacity. The man who thinks he can get out of this

is much mistaken. He will find young women and old women, "flappers" and grandmothers, among his membership—sick and well, rich and poor, great and small. Even if he confines his visits to the sick alone, he will find that a large proportion of these will be women. This fact had better be understood beforehand by himself, his wife, and his people.

Dr. Barstow holds that it is a tactical error for a minister to devote too much of his ministry to women. "Men and young people will sense it and make their own comments. He will never reach uninterested men and boys by specializing on the women." However, we should say that whatever member needs the pastor should receive his attention, regardless of sex or any other condition. Most ministers would much prefer to work with men, but this may not always be done. The ideal minister will hold all his people equal in his heart. There is neither male nor female, bond nor free, Greek nor barbarian in the kingdom of which he is made a minister.

The danger in ministerial service to women is not so much error on the minister's part—though there are doubtless silly women in church as well as out, and there are weak brethren—but the causing of comment and gossip which would embarrass the minister's service. The merest nothing will start a scandal, and the sensible minister knows it and acts accordingly.

Dr. Henry Wilder Foote suggests that calls alone upon young married women in the absence of the husband should be avoided. It is suggested that some other person should be taken along, and this is also a sensible procedure when calling upon a woman whose character is known to be doubtful. Repeated calls

upon any one woman should be avoided, since these will give rise to talk. Anything that will cause gossip and talk should be shunned.

When a woman is sick and in bed the minister should always be sure that someone else is with her when he calls. It is a good rule to find out beforehand if she cares to see him. Wise pastors usually try to have the nurse or attendant go before to arrange the room for the visit.

When a minister comes to be well known in a community he need not be on guard against gossip as much as when he is a newcomer, but any imprudence should always be avoided. More than one minister has been careless and imprudent and had cause to regret it.

Familiarity with women has got to be utterly taboo. "A minister, especially a young one, who puts his hands, however innocent-mindedly, on the person of womankind, particularly young girls, is, in the mildest language I can command, an unmitigated fool," says Dr. Barstow in the article above quoted.[6]

Dr. Foote suggests that the minister should not receive women while he is alone in his office. He adds that when a woman with whose character he is unacquainted comes in, the wife or some other person had best be apprized of the fact and her presence arranged for.

Visiting Jails or Prisons.—In the city prisons or large penal institutions, an official chaplain is usually in charge of the work among the prisoners. If for any reason another minister should visit any of the inmates,

[6] *Church Management*, November, 1926.

the chaplain as well as the other authorities should be consulted first. Our previous suggestions as to getting in touch with authorities at the hospital will hold good also when preparing to visit the jail. Prison rules and regulations are more strict than those of the hospital and will be better enforced. The minister should know and observe these regulations.

The minister visiting the prison has the traditional reputation as friend and counselor of the prisoner. In the army the chaplain was for years the legal council for the accused and acted as defense attorney at all courts-martial. This sometimes led, and may to-day lead in civil life, to the minister becoming such a partisan of the accused as to cause him to be viewed with suspicion by the authorities. He is sometimes charged with a degree of sympathy which discredits justice. In most instances this is not true, but the prison visitor should be on guard against the accusation. Men in prison, especially the convicted, stand in the eyes of the people as guilty of crime, and crime is sin. The minister's attitude here must show no compromise. Too much of the prevalent lawlessness of the day is due to a misguided sentimentality. It takes courage for a minister to impress upon his hearers in jail the idea that crime is crime and guilt is guilt, but he cannot compromise. "We suffer justly," said the penitent thief on the cross. So says every criminal, who, after breaking the laws of God and man, receives pardon from God but not from man. Shilly-shallying here by the pastor will do harm. Let the prison visitor remember it.

Confessions.—The courts allow that confessions made to ministers and priests on the part of prisoners

are privileged communications. A minister therefore may not be compelled to testify against his will, when his testimony on such matters would act against the prisoner. Such confessions are, of course, inviolable, as are all confessions and confidential statements made to a pastor by his members, whether in jail or out. Dr. Douglas's advice against informing the minister's own wife regarding pastoral confidences is to be recalled: "As a private individual even you have no right to this information."[7]

May a minister ever take advantage of a confession or a confidential statement for the purpose of helping the man who made it? Or to prevent what to him is a wrong? This depends. Faith must be kept at all cost; and if a minister makes a pledge of silence, for instance, and under that pledge receives the confession or confidence in question, he must keep his word. At the same time, to receive a confession or make a pledge binding one's future course without ascertaining beforehand something of the nature of the matters in question is not wise. Unprecedented situations often arise, but the unanimous voice of Christians to-day affirms that evil may not be done that good shall come. At any rate a gentleman's word is his bond—and so is a minister's.

Charity Cases.—To deal properly with the whole matter of public charity from a pastor's standpoint is

---

[7] "The confidential statements made to a minister by his parishioners are privileged and should never be divulged without the consent of those making them." (*Congregational Code*, II, 4. *Methodist Code* identical. *Presbyterian Code*, almost so.)

"It is unethical to divulge the confidences of parishioners without their consent." (*Unitarian Code*, III, 3.)

somewhat difficult. When possible, work of this sort ought to be turned over to a social service committee of the church, unless the community has a well-organized system for carrying on such work. It was this very situation which called the Diaconate into being in the early Church, as the sixth chapter of Acts tells us. The ordinary minister will do well to take a tip from the Apostles and escape the obligation of serving tables. The διακονία τοῦ λογοῦ is his special work. However, there are times when the pastor must act as the almoner for his church. The writer, who once endeavored to push this matter off on a lay committee, found that while many needy persons have no objection to a pastor's ministration along this line, they do shrink from having a committee of the church aware of their poverty and need. This, of course, concerned chiefly the better class of charity cases, who were in need, but making a struggle. There is another class whose members do not care who knows their condition, just so they are benefited. The whole matter of charity requires special tact and skill. Where possible the pastor does well to see that this is attended to by others who have a special talent for it. In a few cases he will find that he must attend to it himself. When this happens let him see to it that his right hand (meaning the congregation) does not know what his left hand (meaning himself) doeth.

Borrowers.—One of our poorer, ne'er-do-well members is at the door and wants us to lend him some money. What about it? Here again circumstances will govern, but all things being equal, which they are not, this business of lending money to parishioners should never be begun. If a loan is made to one

member, there is no good reason why it should not be made to others, and the news that a preacher is able and willing to lend money gets around in a wireless but amazing way. This results in loss *to* the preacher and loss *of* the member. There is no person who so sedulously avoids us as the man who owes us money. There will soon be an empty place in the congregation where the fellow sat who borrowed money from his dear pastor, and an equally empty place in his pastor's pocketbook. Most ministers can frankly and truthfully say, when they are thus approached, that they have no money to lend.

Of course, there are cases of need, genuine need. These the minister can usually arrange to meet with money from the poor fund or through a church committee. Most ministers, too, quite often place money, their own money, in the hands of the poor, and this is right, for there are times when by every law of God and man a minister must give. When this is the case let it be a gift in the Name of Christ. Let it not be called "a loan" unless this is necessary to secure its acceptance. Let it go as bread upon the waters in the work of God.

Fakes.—Ministers have long been considered easy marks for fakes, frauds, and confidence men. We are happy to believe, however, that our reputation along this line is not as "good" as it once was. Yet occasionally some stranger knocks at our door, and leaves us after a few minutes marveling at the fertility of the human brain. The story most commonly told is of a dying relative in a distant place, of how the necessary fare to see the loved one is lacking (or part lacking), and a request for a "loan" of the amount needed.

Most ministers can supply other versions of this story, and some of the variations are compositions worthy of the great masters. A good way to test such persons is to ask regarding a minister in the town they claim as home, and if the stranger says he knows him (the Presbyterian, Methodist, or Baptist preacher) to tell him that you will wire or phone and if the local minister indorses him it will be all right. The writer has heard some queer objections to securing this information—doesn't want his town to know his condition; doesn't want to trouble the preacher. Needless to say a genuine fake at this point is glad to *nolle pros* the matter and move on.

Of course, not all supplicants are frauds. Food to a hungry tramp, a coin to a beggar—charity is part of the minister's task. "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers," says the writing, "for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." But it is to be very much wished that we might know the genuine trade-mark of the angels when we see it and not have to threaten to telephone or telegraph to get a visé on the celestial credentials.[8]

Agents.—These come with sure-fire propositions for the good of the Aid Society, or for money for the new building fund. In cases of this kind canny ministers are glad to let the Aid Society have them with all their literature and all their works. Ministers have enough to do without engaging in such petty and unprofitable schemes.

---

[8]A minister should be very careful to protect his brother ministers from imposition by unworthy applicants for aid, and should refer such cases to established charitable agencies rather than to send them to other churches. (*Presbyterian Code, III, 5.*)

CHAPTER VI

THE CHURCH

A MINISTER'S ethical obligations toward his Church can be separated into two main divisions: Those relating to his denomination or Church general; those relating to his own pulpit and parish, or church local.

THE DENOMINATION

General Representative Character.—The minister represents his own denomination or Church in the minds of the people. Of late years there has been quite a discussion regarding this representative character of the ministry. Men who find themselves out of sympathy with certain of the doctrines or methods of the denomination whose name they bear have rebelled against the idea that their own ministry should be circumscribed or directed by regulations laid down by others, even by the mind of their own church representatives. Much is heard of "freedom in the pulpit" and of "Christian liberty."

This entire situation can best be judged when one understands the exact status of the relation which every minister holds to his denomination. The following statement, we believe, will assist in clarifying this matter and will be agreed to by most ministers.

Every minister has entered into some kind of covenant with the Church which commissioned him. With some this was by vows of ordination in which the minister obligated himself to follow a certain course of conduct, and perhaps assented to a definite creed.

With the less centralized denominations, the questions asked and the agreement made were not always so definite, but in nearly all Protestant denominations some sort of test or promise is exacted of every man who offers himself as a candidate for that particular ministry. This test or requirement is of course always known beforehand to the candidate, who nevertheless offers himself, and answers the questions to the satisfaction of the denomination, or takes the required vows. When this is done, the denomination, through its committee, congregation, presbytery, bishop, council, or what-not, licenses, ordains, or approves the man and sends him forth as one well fit to preach the doctrine and carry on the work belonging to its particular mission. The Church thenceforth relies on the minister's promises, answers, or vows. Most denominations never again formally question their ministers. For the duration of a minister's life his Church relies upon the obligation once taken or vows once made. This is a truth that is not apparent at a casual glance, but is of supreme importance in viewing this problem. Every minister has promised or sworn himself to a certain course of conduct or discipline through which he became the representative of his own denomination. He was not coerced, he need not have done this, but of his own accord he offered himself, was taken at his word and promise, had a certain stamp of approval put upon him, and was admitted to that particular ministry. Forever after that he is declared unto the world to be a duly accredited minister according to the doctrine, discipline, and polity of his Church.

The Church after this has the right to expect of him, either that he will keep his vows and execute his

promises; or that he will terminate the covenant or representative arrangement if he cannot or will not keep it. All Churches make provision for such termination of the ministerial status. Either Church or minister has a right to end the mutual agreement. The Church has the inalienable right which is enjoyed by every sovereign corporate body from the Congress of the United States to the small-town debating society —namely, to act as judge of the qualifications of its own members. The minister, on his side, has the right to withdraw from any organization whose methods or beliefs he cannot indorse. This right to sever relationship, which must be allowed to both Church and minister, is not unfair to either, but a safeguard to both. To hold otherwise would be to insist that a great body of believers support and keep as their representative one who is not *in esse* their representative, or to take the equally intolerant attitude that a minister should continue to preach assent to doctrines to which his heart cannot subscribe. There is no more reason for asking a Church to place in its pulpits a man whose teaching and beliefs are not in accord with its own than for asking the British Empire to let a Member of Congress from Missouri sit in Parliament. On the other hand, there is no more reason for a denomination to expect a minister to serve in its pulpits against his own convictions of right than there is for Congress to pass a law establishing a State religion and compelling all men to subscribe thereto. The way out is clear. Let an irksome partnership be dissolved. The Church can then get for herself men who will agree to her beliefs or meet her tests; the minister may get for himself a pulpit with some other fellowship to whose

doctrines or lack of doctrines he may agree, or failing that, may gather about him like believers and worship with them where he pleases. Dr. Henry Wilder Foote has a fine chapter on the liberty of the pulpit in "The Minister and His Parish," and comes to the conclusion that the minister's liberty is bound by the law of that Church to which he belongs. This, we think, will be agreed to by all as sound and sensible.

Heterodoxy.—It may be urged that a minister may be in agreement with his own Church on most or all essentials, but may have his private opinion regarding certain minor points—of doctrine, for instance. It is sometimes said that every man is a heretic at some one point. It is true that all have personal theories or vagaries of thought or fancy, and doubtless there are minor points of belief in which every minister differs from the thought of his own Church, perhaps from that of the long line of Christian thinking. Should a man therefore withdraw from his Church or insist that such matters deserve the attention of all? We do not believe so. Minor opinions, even doubts of an inconsequential nature, are no part of a minister's message, nor do they injure his work, and the rule, "Preach your *dos* and not your *doubts*," is sound. Most ministers, therefore, leave unsolved or perplexing problems alone, and fail to enlarge upon any difference of interpretation or doctrine which they hold against the thought of their own fellowship. There is no more reason for a minister to withdraw from his denomination because he cannot agree with it upon some minor question of polity or doctrine than there is for a wife to seek a divorce because she does not like the kind of necktie which her husband insists on

wearing. Before the congregation too much discussion of the minor points in question will not be expedient. It is very unwise, not to say wrong, to plant in the minds of the people vague questions and a train of speculations concerning problems over which the best minds of the ages have been exercised. The cardinal doctrines of righteousness and truth are being violated daily, and there is need to preach *them*. Leave speculation alone, say the wisest of the ministers, and preach from the vast reservoir of truth which is filled to overflowing. "But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain."

Withdrawal from the Church. — What is to most ministers a minor matter, unprofitable and vain, may become to one man or set of men a question of the highest importance. Such men may believe that to keep silent is to do wrong. If his Church will not see this matter in the light in which he views it, such a man may feel impelled to withdraw from its fellowship. This has happened numberless times, and there is no discredit to either Church or minister when a spirit of fairness and toleration has been mutually manifested. The man is the judge. If he does decide to withdraw of his own accord, he should give formal notice and in an orderly way turn over to the proper authorities all papers, records, and property which he has held by virtue of the connection which he now terminates.

Criticism and disparaging remarks about one's own denomination are sometimes heard from the pulpit. Often this is done in the spirit of the family circle whose members feel that they have the right to crit-

icize each other since they love each other. However, it is not wise nor will it always be understood when a member of either a family or a Church publicly criticizes his own. To say the least, it is in bad taste.[1]

Legitimate and constructive criticism is, of course, looked for by every large organization, and these, including churches, usually have constitutional ways for registering the opinion of their own membership and for making any changes that may be deemed wise. Most ministers are profoundly interested in the general relationships of their own denomination and are keen critics of its courses of action. However, most of them consider it better to effect reforms or obtain changes in policy or creed through constitutional methods. They do not usually go to such lengths as to damage the Church by public criticism or threatened withdrawal. Many of the ecclesiastical-statesman type ignore such methods, nor do they issue many controversial statements to the general press. They wait until the time of the council, or convention, or assembly, and then before their peers in conference assembled make the fight for what they hold to be right. Criticism of the general polity of the Church when it comes from local pulpits seldom does any good and is embarrassing to visitors.

Schism.—The question is sometimes asked: What is to be done when no redress for wrong may be obtained through denominational channels? Is one then justified in using extraconstitutional means to bring about what he believes to be right? Shall one, to use a military simile, neglect the "regular military

[1] "The minister should never speak disparagingly of his Church or his profession." (*Unitarian Code*, I, 6.)

channels" through which protests, and requests, are expected to pass from the lowest officer to the highest (provided no one stops them *en route!*) and appeal directly to the powers that be, irrespective of constitutional methods or anything else?

This is the crucial question regarding all rebellion, all revolution. In a measure each case is to be judged upon its own merits and, historically and politically at least, by its results. Martin Luther and George Washington, to name two notable examples, achieved what history declares to have been right by using extraconstitutional means. In the case of the ordinary minister and the laws of his Church we are inclined to take the view that the dissenting person will as a rule better achieve his results by working through regular channels than by disregarding them. The man who decides to gain his end regardless of constitution or previous customs, although he may be right under other standards, must be prepared to be treated as a rebel by the organization. It might be observed also that schismatic types as a rule seldom get very far. If they have truth with them, that will eventually prevail; but if they have but a modicum of truth, they will prevail only in a moderate way. Neither Churches nor political parties last long when founded upon one issue, and the graveyard of dead Churches and political parties will show it. One idea may create a schism, but will not produce an enduring Church. In the last analysis, as Carlyle says, every idea must stand in its own strength and get for itself what life it may.

As a rule, individuals, especially men, get farther by standing with their organization. Men are intuitively doubtful about the fellow who bolts. There is a certain

type in every organization which will rule or ruin, and will not be bound by majority decision. We would not curtail Christian liberty nor that of conscience, and the man who decides to revolt may do so if he chooses, but let him make up his mind that he is entirely willing to wear the stigma of a rebel before he begins.

The Local Church

Mutual Rights.—In the relationship that exists between a pastor and his own particular parish, pastor and congregation should clearly understand their mutual rights under both church and civil law. Church laws differ in different places, and legal relationships and rights also vary under different charters. Often it takes a factional fight to bring out the exact legal status of mutual rights. Sometimes minister or church has to appeal to Cæsar, and the *ipse dixit* of a civil judge in a court of chancery finally outlines the rights and obligations of both parties. On such occasions the matter may be settled according to the law, but not according to the Prophets—hostility is everlastingly perpetuated. So ministerial prerogatives and oversight, trustees' control and property rights, membership rights, and the like, ought to be understood very thoroughly by all parties concerned.[2]

He would be a foolish minister of course who constantly reminded his people that legally he has this particular right or that special privilege, just as any people would take the heart out of their minister by

[2] "The minister is the recognized leader of the parish, but he should not assume authority in Church affairs which is not expressly granted him by the terms of his contract, or the usage of his office, or the vote of his Church." (*Unitarian Code*, II, 2.)

making him feel that they are suspicious of his control and must therefore hedge him in with legal restrictions. Nevertheless the minister will do well to know the law of his Church regarding his office, the law of the State in which he lives concerning his ministerial rights, and the legal points involved in his own special contract with the local church—if there be a contract.

The pulpit is conceded by all as rightfully belonging to the minister. The proclamation of gospel truth is his special mission, and it is also tacitly understood that he must be allowed to have control of all formal worship in the church. Certain churches qualify the pastor's control of the pulpit by stipulated restrictions, but the consensus of opinion holds that the minister should have entire control of it.[3]

Policies against the temper of the local church should be carefully considered before the minister introduces them. He may be morally right and personally strong enough to force them into effect, but the support of his people is one of his greatest assets. Forfeit that, and the loss is irreparable.

The Minister's Time.—We have already discussed the matter of the minister's time from a professional standpoint, but this should be remembered in connection with the local church. A minister may very properly resent the implication that money can pay him for his services, but nevertheless there is a sense in which his time and ability do belong to the local church. No one, of course, tells him how to divide

[3] "The minister rightfully controls his own pulpit, but he should not invite persons into it who are not generally acceptable to his parish, and he should be ready to accede to all reasonable requests by responsible Church officials for its use." (*Unitarian Code*, II, 3.)

his time, but he should not assume that he is independent of the people who "make the pot boil" for him.[4]

Finances.—Laymen are more and more assuming control of church finances. This is well, and the ministry with a universal sigh of relief will be glad to leave money matters entirely to the membership of the church. Some ministers take an extreme position here and even refuse to allow matters affecting the financial status of the church to be brought to their attention. This attitude on the part of a few pastors was attacked in a recent magazine article. The writer took the position that the minister as head of the church ought at least to be sufficiently interested in the struggle his men are making to sit with them as counselor. Dr. Henry Wilder Foote takes the sensible position that a minister should know of the financial affairs of his parish and sit with his Board, but have no duty toward raising or disbursing money. This, we believe, will generally be accepted as wise. The pastor naturally wishes his laymen to have charge of

[4] "As a minister controls his own time, he should make it a point of honor to give full service to his parish." (*Congregational Code*, I, 1. *Presbyterian Code* identical.)

"When a Methodist minister becomes a member of Conference he promises to employ all of his time in the work of God. We again call attention to the fact that he is thus in honor bound to give full service to his parish." (*Methodist Code.*)

"It is unethical for the minister to engage in other lines of remunerative work without the knowledge and consent of the Church or its official board." (*Congregational Code*, II, 3.)

"He should be conscientious in giving full time and strength to the work of his Church, engaging in avocations and other occupations in such a way and to such a degree as not to infringe unduly upon that work unless some definite arrangement for part-time service is made with the Church." (*Unitarian Code*, I, 2.)

and do well all laymen's work. He does not wish to add to his own heavy burdens, but by no means does he wish to give the impression that he is not interested in any affair, financial or otherwise, that may affect his church. The tactful man will know how to help without hindering, be present without dominating, the financial committee of the church.

Church Property.—The minister should always remember that church property *is* the property of the church. He may very properly consider the parsonage, or manse, or rectory, or pastorium, or whatever his house may be called, as his own property so long as he has charge of that parish. This should be known and appreciated by others, as trouble has sometimes been made by officious church property committees. Nevertheless the most deeply rooted pastor, geographically speaking, will do well to remember that the title to his house is held by others and that he is but a sojourner, as all his predecessors were. This will check him in the matter of taking any unusual steps with regard to church property until the responsible officials have been consulted. The same principle holds also with regard to renting church or even parsonage property for the purpose of gaining additional revenue. The minister who is wise will wish to know how his people feel about such a step before it is taken. The pastor may be well within his rights in renting rooms in the parsonage, but he will save himself some trouble by finding out beforehand how the people view this matter. Church people are perfectly willing to see their pastor made the beneficiary of parsonage property himself, but some have an illogical but strong aversion toward seeing

"outsiders" benefit by it. This is a situation that no logic will reach, and the wise minister will take people as they are and not as they ought to be.

Church Records.—These belong to the church. "The records of the Church must be kept with care," states Dr. Gladden. Protestant ministers, especially of the less centralized denominations, are woefully lacking in this. The Roman Catholic Church can teach some good lessons in preserving records of baptisms and marriages. These sometimes become extremely valuable to the persons involved, and yet few local churches make anything like farsighted preparation for keeping them. The minister must lead in this. He should locate and preserve past records, add his own to these, and keep them for the future in an accurate and systematic way. All records and papers should be turned over to the succeeding minister with careful explanations regarding their nature.

Personal records ought to be kept by every minister and, of course, are private property. Some good system for keeping them ought to be followed. Personal records have the advantage of acting as a check on official records.

Church Money.—When church money is handled by the minister or when he is made special treasurer for any fund he must be most accurate. Carelessness here is beyond forgiveness. The public was surprised within recent years by the trial and conviction of a man who occupied a leading place in a great reform organization. His plight is said to have been brought about by hostile parties who seized on the poorly kept records of his organization and through these obtained

a conviction. Whatever may have been the merits of that case, it is a fact that those who handle money—all philanthropic organizations, committees for relief, etc.—should keep their books so that they may be ready for examination at a moment's notice. Let the minister watch this point carefully, for some have lost pulpits by giving adversaries an opportunity to attack them through their own carelessness.

Candidature and Overtures.—Dr. Washington Gladden in his great work ("The Christian Pastor and the Working Church") discusses at some length the whole matter of candidature. Following Dr. Gladden we shall discuss this matter in a twofold way: The seeking of a pastorate by a minister, and the efforts to obtain a minister by a "vacant" church. Candidature involves some complicated questions, for, besides a man's own rights, those of other ministers and congregations must be considered.

Dr. Gladden states that a vacant church has the right to make overtures to whomsoever it pleases, whether the minister in question be attached or unattached, "as no church possesses exclusive right to any minister." It may be imagined, however, that complications and ill feeling may arise when one church is found endeavoring to take away the beloved minister of another congregation. A great deal depends on how the subject is broached, and what sort of spirit is maintained. Dr. Gladden intimates that the minister in the case should be passive in regard to such overtures, until of course it becomes his duty to make a decision. Certainly the pastor who obviously has his ear to the ground to catch attractive calls from other places, or who takes pleasure in flaunting before

his congregation flattering offers from other churches, will create the impression that he is on the auction block for the highest bidder.

When overtures come to a minister from a church whose pastor has not yet resigned, the universal instruction of the ministry is to let such calls alone. This is absolute.[5]

Gladden quotes Wilcoxen's "Pastor Amidst His Flock" as saying that "no church should enter into negotiations with a second candidate while it has one before it whose case has not been determined, and no minister should permit himself to be considered as a candidate by a church until he is positively assured that that church is negotiating with no candidate with whom it has not reached a decision." A minister, of course, may not have the power to forestall overtures from other churches, but the last part of the above quotation he may heed. Ministers shrink from being drawn into a contest with each other for a vacant place, and preserve self-respect better by refusing to strive with one another for an open pulpit. A minister, like a maiden, should insist on being told that he is the one and only person who is in the mind of the wooer—in this case, the congregation.

When the pastor has not resigned and the pulpit is not vacant, no minister worthy of the name will listen to an overture nor make one. The codes we quote enjoin that, but there is another and Greater Code

[5] "It is unethical for a minister to make overtures to or consider overtures from a Church whose pastor has not yet resigned." (*Congregational Code*, III, 3. *Presbyterian Code* almost identical.)

"He should discourage all overtures from a Church whose minister has not yet resigned." (*Unitarian Code*, IV, 3.)

whose whole spirit and temper forbid a man of God to force out or connive at the deposition of a brother minister. In this let no one be deceived. The excuse may be given: "I can do well that work of God which I see the present incumbent doing so poorly." That may be true, but we must leave God to watch above His own. Work no harm to thy neighbor. By doing ill no one can possibly bring about good.

Where the minister himself decides to seek a church that is vacant, it seems agreed that he is at liberty to advance his candidacy by any above-board and dignified means. Wilcoxen, whose work has been mentioned, felt in his time that it was better for the candidate not to apply in person, but get some other party to introduce his name and qualifications. That was some years ago, and in our modern age more aggressive methods bring results in a simpler and more direct way. Personal conduct will be the basis of the pastor's success finally, and we believe the modern ministry would feel it best, and certainly more forceful, for the candidate to present himself in person where possible. No amount of commendatory letters can equal a ten-minute view of the man in question in the pulpit. Dr. Gladden says that it is right to preach a trial sermon if a man be honestly seeking the place, but it must be confessed that the occasion is one which is very hard on the man himself. He wishes to do his best and make sure of success with the people, and yet to give them his very best sermon may let the people in for a long term of misgivings afterwards if they accept him as pastor, for they will have been shown, not a sample of his preaching, but the cream of it.

> In this connection the writer would like to put in the advice of an old Methodist preacher who had served many appointments in his time. "When you go to a new place," said this old man, "never preach the best sermon you have the first time you are there. If you do, the people's expectations will be raised so high that you may never be able to satisfy them again. Don't preach your worst sermon either. Just give them a middling good stiff sermon, and you have got room after that to go in either direction."

There should be no flaw in the spirit or letter of the title which gives a man a new pulpit and parish. Dr. Gladden discusses the question as to whether a man should accept a call when he learns that it is by no means unanimous. He quotes approvingly Wilcoxen, who answered this question by saying: "That depends." His advice is to examine the size of the opposing minority and see whether it is "reasonable or obstinate." A hostile minority of any kind is a factor to be seriously reckoned with, and most men will wonder which kind of group would be harder to fight, an "obstinate" or a "reasonable" one.

Resignation from one pulpit in order to take up work in another ought to be done in such a way as to safeguard the interests of the work one leaves. Church contracts, where there are such, usually specify that a number of months' notice shall be given by either party expecting to terminate the relationship. At any rate, a minister who decides to resign is in duty bound to do so in a formal manner, and should arrange with the proper persons in regard to turning over property, records, and administrative functions.[6]

[6] "The minster's relation to his parish is a sacred contract, which should not be terminated by him, or broken by his resignation,

Church Publicity.—The modern minister is expected to know something of publicity methods and to use them for the benefit of his church. It is the era of the press agent, and church publicity is but a phase of the great science of advertising which America has so well learned. Church bulletins, illuminated signs, floodlighted churches, advertising stunts of all sorts are used by many ministers. Church people take pride in seeing their church frequently mentioned in the press, and like to see the name of their minister looming large in the church news section. Publicity methods on a big, unashamed scale are so recent in church circles that until very lately no one, so far as the writer can learn, ever attempted to discuss them in relation to the higher work of the Church and ministry. A very sane editorial came out in *Church Management* in May, 1927 (William H. Leach, Editor), and we have drawn heavily upon that for the few regulations which we believe should govern every minister's conduct in advertising his church.

1. Publicity must be truthful. There can be no misleading statements, no exaggeration. "It" (the church), says Dr. Leach, "has no right to advertise a great sermon and then have the preacher enter the pulpit to utter platitudes which are well worn. It has no moral right to advertise a great musical service and then offer a half-baked program which would be barred from any musical test." It might be added here that even though a church should be able to

without at least three months' notice, except by special agreement." (*Unitarian Code*, II, 1.)

"It is unethical for the minister to break his contract, made with the Church." (*Congregational Code*, II, 1.)

deceive the people and the press on one or two occasions, this could not be done often. Truth, like honesty, is the best policy.

2. The advertising must not be greater than the thing advertised. In other words, it must be the servant of the church and not the master. This principle will prevent an excessive expenditure for publicity and keep all things in proportion. When publicity comes to be the chief thing about a church, when in the popular mind the name of that church is but a synonym for freak advertising stunts, or a menagerie, or a fashion show, or a vaudeville, then the church has gone in for a publicity which makes it less than a church. "Laymen have a right to protest," Dr. Leach says, "when some minister, carried away with the glare of notoriety, turns the house of God into a public market place. If he must use the tactics of the soap box orator, let him take his soap box into the market place, but when the bell calls folks to the worship of the Eternal he should enter into the courts of holiness with prayer and seriousness."

3. Dr. Leach suggests also that the minister cannot afford any publicity reflecting upon his sincerity or his character, nor any which "makes him appear as a religious mountebank or freak." While it is true that advertising is lawful if lawfully used, it is also a fact that Truth has a strange way of manifesting itself. The church that is fulfilling its mission soon becomes known for what it is. Lawful publicity is good and no one pleads for the shrinking-violet church, but there is something about the blatant modern way of "telling the world" that is against the drift of the Master's teaching. He had no condemnation for publicans and

sinners equal to that which he poured out upon those who sounded a trumpet before them when they gave alms, and who made long prayers in public that they might be seen of men. There may be some warrant for telling the city about the church, but the minister who studies how he may constantly tell the city about himself, his sermon, his methods, his vacation, his opinions, that man does not fall far short of the ancient ecclesiastics who loved the chief seats in the synagogues, and disfigured their faces that they might appear unto men to fast. Publicity is a splendid thing in its place, and the modern minister should know something about it, but there is something else about which he should know more. The writer heard Dr. Paul Elmer More of Princeton once lecture to a small group on Græco-Christian philosophy. "The thing the Church has lost to-day," said Dr. More, "and the thing it used to have, is this"—and he went to the blackboard and wrote on it:

ταπεινοφροσύνη.

Get out your Greek lexicon, brother, and look it up. It is worth thinking about. (See explanatory note on page 175.)

CHAPTER VII

PUBLIC WORSHIP

It is as the conductor of public worship that the minister takes the special place that is his. This is true whether he stands forth to preach or to pray, to announce a hymn or baptize an infant. What a unique place he now occupies! He stands before his fellow mortals as the representative of the Deathless, Immortal God; he directs and guides these fellow mortals to worship rightly and worthily praise this God. He furthermore sets the example by his own public action and bearing in rightly representing and worthily speaking for Him whom he serves.

The atmosphere of public worship should be carefully guarded by the minister. "Atmosphere is everything," says Dr. Jefferson.[1] "Blessed is the preacher who converts his church into a temple, and who, with or without pictured windows and without or with the help of ritual and rich architecture, creates by the conduct of his service an atmosphere in which souls look Godward." This is true. The atmosphere, the overtone of the congregation gathered to worship God, is different from that found in any other place in the world. Children of the church, strangers, even scoffers, sense that atmosphere instantly. Certain ecclesiastical organizations have carefully studied this matter and make everything possible combine to induce a feeling of reverence and unique position—

[1] "The Building of the Church," p. 123.

the windows, statuary, even the lowly sense of smell is appealed to by clouds of smoke from swinging censer—and whatever heads may say, hearts feel that there is something that transcends the ordinary in the house of God. Hymns, prayers, sermon, even announcements, all should harmonize with and add to this sense of the Presence.

The minister who does not feel this most keenly has had a faint call to what others know for a most sacred office. The man who feels himself as free and unrestrained in conducting public worship as though he were at a golf match at the country club has not come close to the Almighty. Wretched are the people whose worship is ordered for them by such a man. Like priest, like people. If the minister in the midst of a gathering of worshipers does not feel the presence of the Most High in a unique way, how may the people feel it?

The minister in his pulpit or before his people in the church should be so aware of the sacred and peculiar place that he occupies that the people will too become aware of it and of their own place. The Urim and Thummim of Jehovah should shine on the spiritual breastplate of his modern ministers, and when the people feel it, as though some new Sinai be smoking, they will be prepared for thunderings and lightnings and the voice of God. Let the minister before his people constantly remember these things and break not the spirit of worship which belongs to God.

It is not possible to take up all the various angles and points that pertain to public worship. The sermon, for instance, is worship, but we cannot leave our special field and attempt a dissertation on preaching.

Public prayer is worship of a most intense and complicated kind, but we cannot here discuss the merits of ordered or extempore prayer. The reading of Scripture, the giving of announcements, the taking of the offering, all is worship. We may not do more here than give a brief outline of approved practice in managing the various parts of the service in the modern church.

Preparation.—The minister feels it a professional duty as well as an ethical and religious one to be prepared beforehand for the conduct of every service. Circumstances, of course, occasionally force the minister into situations where he is able to make no preparation worthy of the name, but the service is always the poorer when this happens. The ministers of all denominations condemn a brother minister who comes unprepared when he takes his place as the leader of public worship.

This matter of preparation is commonly taken to refer to preparation for preaching, but all churches, even the non-liturgical, are coming to place more and more emphasis on the various parts of the service other than the preaching. No longer are we thinking in terms of preaching alone; but, as Dr. Jefferson has it, the whole service from the first note of the voluntary unto the last peal of the organ is worship. So preparation on the minister's part has to do with many things. What is his Scripture lesson, and will he be able to read it as it should be read? Is he ready to lead the prayers? Fortunately, most parts of the church service, like the vital functions of life, become matters of routine—that is to say, habit. Where there is to be no special variation of his regular order of worship the minister is left free to prepare himself for the

sermon and other parts that must necessarily be different in each recurrent service, and need not be concerned about the invariable parts of his order of worship which come to be as familiar to him as the fit of his own clothes.

When a special service is to take place, or a special feature to be introduced, all should be carefully arranged beforehand. Suppose another minister is to preach. Details regarding the essential parts of the service should be explained to him in advance. The necessary consultation between ministers should take place before the service and not before the people. Anything that savors of lack of preparation—apparent attempts to select hymns or to settle on a passage of Scripture to be read, etc.—mars the atmosphere of worship and should be arranged beforehand.

Preparation for a minister's own part in the worship is not merely a matter of intellectual application or "cramming" on a sermon outline at the last minute, but rests upon "deeper inconsequent deeps." The quiet hour before the service, the prayer in private, the cultivation of the Presence—these sometimes mean more than subhead *b* in division III of the sermon. Ministers may prepare in more ways than one.

Processional.—Liturgical churches have a very formal entrance for their clergymen and priests. The non-liturgical churches have never featured this, but it seems fitting for the minister to keep himself somewhat secluded until the time for the service. Usually the minister remains in his study, where he may meditate or have a private prayer before he appears.

The actual entrance of the minister—in those churches which do not conform to an ordered proces-

sional—should be dignified but not ostentatious. Henry Ward Beecher had a very decided opinion along this line. "I abhor," he said, "the formal, stately, and solemn entrance of the man whose whole appearance seems to call on all to see how holy he is." Daniel P. Kidder enjoined an entrance in "a manner true to the dignity and meekness of the holy office," and the consensus of opinion among ministers will, we believe, agree with Dr. Kidder's view. A gentleman would not go into a lady's parlor in a slovenly, matter-of-fact way, but courteously and quietly. So should a man enter the pulpit of God.

Punctuality is a desideratum in beginning a service. Let the minister appear before his people on the stroke of the hour, or a moment or two beforehand—perhaps during the organ prelude, if there is one. In modern churches the pastor's study quite often opens on the pulpit. When there is a visiting minister or ministers the pastor acts as usher for them, leading the way until the pulpit platform is reached, when he steps aside after indicating what seats his brethren are to occupy. The central seat, if there be more than one, is generally assigned to the preacher of the hour or to the guest of honor. Sometimes, however, visiting ministers prefer that the local minister keep the central seat—his usual place—as presiding officer.

It is the custom of many ministers to bow or kneel for a private prayer after they have entered the pulpit. This practice was called "of doubtful propriety" by John A. Broadus, and Henry Ward Beecher entertained much the same opinion. Dr. Kidder approved this custom, but suggested that the minister turn toward the wall to make clear that the prayer was for himself

alone. Some ministers arrange for a silent prayer by the congregation at this initial point in the service. Others have an invocation immediately, calling for reverence and quiet with uplifted hand.

Conduct in the Pulpit.—Nowhere more than in the pulpit should the minister show forth his best qualities as a gentleman. Not only is he under the atmosphere of worship, but he is also a gentleman in company, and what a gentleman may not say or do in the parlor of a lady must certainly not be done in the house of God. Dr. John A. Kern, a well-known Southern writer, in his work on "The Ministry to the Congregation" (p. 26), gives a list of errors in pulpit decorum which we reprint here. While some of these are never seen to-day, it will do no harm to reprint Dr. Kern's list:

> To talk and laugh in the pulpit with some brother minister—though ready to rebuke with uncalled-for severity a similar offense in the congregation. [The writer should like to add to this that any needless conversation between ministers in the pulpit should be suppressed. Such common communication as is necessary for order in the service should be done gravely and in a tone inaudible to the congregation.]
>
> To gaze vacantly or curiously about, instead of being occupied cheerfully, gravely, and intently with the duty of the hour.
>
> To smooth his hair, to "brush it unnaturally back from his forehead that its roughness may look terrible," to adjust his clothing or in any way to put the finishing touch to his toilet before the congregation.
>
> While some one else is leading in prayer, to fumble the leaves of the hymn book in search of the next hymn.

To rise restlessly to find his Scripture lesson before the singing is done.

To lounge upon the pulpit sofa.

To sit with his legs crossed in the form of a triangle (an intolerably unseemly habit).

To blow his nose as if it were a trumpet.

To use his handkerchief needlessly.

To ascend from the chancel to the pulpit platform at one stride, ignoring the steps.

To throw his overcoat over the chancel rail, and put his hat on one of the posts.

To reprove disorder so as to create greater disorder.

To remember some announcement a little late and give it after the people have bowed their heads for the benediction.

To show a spirit of levity, of absent-mindedness, of slouchiness, of rudeness, in any of the innumerable ways in which it is inevitably betrayed.

Most of these breaks in decorum can be classed as an affront to that spirit of worship of which we have written. The others are faults in gentlemanly bearing and are out of place in any company. To lounge in one's seat in a parlor, for instance, is a breach of decorum, as is the tilting back of the chair, since these postures indicate an ease or unconcern which is disrespectful to the company. If such acts are out of place in the parlor, much more are they impossible in the pulpit.

The Hymns and Church Music.—When the minister announces a hymn let him give the number in such a way that all may hear. Let him repeat the number. There are persons in every audience who, having ears, hear not, even when they are listening. Occasionally we have heard an accomplished master of public worship give out the number of the hymn, then read the

first line of it or call its name, then give out the number again. This is a good plan. The old-fashioned custom of reading the hymn has disappeared. It took time to do this, but it took art also, for not every man can read poetry well. Hymns especially are hard to read. As a rule the minister should let the organ and choir take the hymn as it is written and sing it through. However, for the sake of lightening a service, some ministers adopt the plan of calling for the repetition of certain stanzas, or they exhort the people to sing with more spirit, or call attention, as John Wesley urged should be done, to the words which are being sung. People like to sing, and the wise minister when he sees that they are singing lets them sing on. Choirs and church music are traditionally uncertain factors, and when working well, let them work.

When the people are singing let the minister also stand and sing. Dean Brown has this to say to the minister: "Sing yourself! Do it as a means of grace to your own soul! Do it also as a bit of Godly example to your people. The lazy, shiftless minister who announces a hymn and then goes back to his chair and sits down while the people stand up and sing it, as if praising God were no affair of his, ought to be cast out of the synagogue. Unless he is a semi-invalid, almost too weak to be there at all, he ought to be pitched out of his pulpit forthwith by some athletic deacon ordained of God as the Scripture says, 'to purchase to himself a good degree and great boldness in the faith' by thus exercising his authority as an officer of the Church militant."[2]

---

[2] "The Art of Preaching," p. 207.

The Prayers.—We cannot discuss this subject at length, for it is one upon which many books have been written and many more might be. It may be well, however, to make one or two general observations.

1. Prayer is addressed to God, not the people. If this is understood, it will keep all prayer reverent, humble, and quiet. Dr. Broadus said that in public prayer the minister should "earnestly endeavor to *realize what he is doing.*" He is talking to God. We have heard prayers which stormed the skies, when the voice and tones of the suppliant made the rafters ring. If this be natural to the man, it is his way of talking and must be respected, but the most of us feel that God will not hear us for our loud speaking any more than for our much speaking, nor do we ordinarily think of him as off on a long journey or perchance asleep. We instinctively feel that reverence is shown by quiet. The "utterance of prayer should be softer, more level . . . less vehement, more subdued. Every tone should breathe tenderness and supplication. It is difficult to say which is most unsuitable to this sacred exercise—a hurried, perfunctory utterance as of one who reads some tiresome or trivial matter, a violent and declamatory manner, as though one had ventured upon objurgation of his Maker, or a headlong and confused enunciation."[3]

A corollary here is that since in prayer man addresses God, he should not at the same time attempt to address the audience. "To pray with elaborate compliment for another minister present is a grossly improper practice," says Broadus, and states that Robert Hall

[3] Dabney, "Sacred Rhetoric," per Broadus.

sometimes erred in praying for distinguished persons in his audiences.

2. The minister prays for the entire congregation—that is, he attempts to lead the prayers of all to God. This keeps him, or should keep him, from expressing his own private feelings. Since he is the mouthpiece of all, any tendency toward giving way to personal sentiments or expressing his own opinions should be carefully watched.

3. Prayers should not be long. If anyone wishes to disagree with this statement, we may drop the categorical expression above, and say, "Prayers should not be *too* long." Whitefield is said to have once rebuked a man who prayed a long prayer by saying: "Sir, you prayed me into a good frame, and then you prayed me out of it." Prayer is not expected to take the place of the sermon in formal worship. Dr. Burton[4] tells of a minister who told the Lord so much in an opening prayer, that the speaker of the occasion had no thunder, and not much heart, left. Prayer has a field all its own in both public and private worship. Happy is the man who can commune with God in the presence of his people.

The correct posture in prayer has always been a debatable matter. Broadus has some sensible remarks as to making prayer audible to all, and holds therefore that the hands are not to be placed before the face, that one should not bend forward, nor keep the head down. "We must also avoid contortions of countenance and tricks of posture and gesture, which there will always be some persons to notice."[5]

[4] "In Pulpit and Parish."

[5] "Preparation and Delivery of Sermons," p. 535.

Scripture Readings.—These should be selected and studied beforehand if they are to be later read in public. Public reading of the Scriptures is hard to do well, and in order to succeed, familiarity is essential. Broadus says that pronunciation should be carefully studied, and suggests also that where "indelicate expressions as we see it" occur, these may be omitted if this can be done without attracting attention.

Commenting upon the Scripture lesson while reading it does not find favor with some ministers. "Give it to the people unvarnished," said one of our authorites; "let the Word be its own witness." But Dr. Nathaniel J. Burton would disagree here. "Comment on it as you read," he said; "expound and explain for the people—you are an expounder of the Word of God." The matter therefore is left for the individual to decide. Sometimes the austere simplicity of the Book would be marred and mangled by our poor emendations; sometimes the preacher strikes a passage that the great minds of the ages have been unable to interpret. Usually obscure readings are to be avoided; but when a minister is called upon to read a lesson which may be made clear by a few words from him, he feels it a duty and pleasure to give these words.

Read so that the man on the back seat can hear and understand. It may be recalled that Oliver Wendell Holmes has told us that the average intelligence of an audience is that of a thirteen-year-old-boy. That of course referred to an audience in O. W. H.'s time and not in ours, and perhaps Dr. Holmes made this observation after he had failed to "get over" his latest lecture. Nevertheless, the lesson should be so

read that if there be any thirteen-year-olds present, they will hear and understand.

A great many ministers open the Bible reverently when they come into the pulpit, and close it reverently as the service ends. The Bible is the charter and warrant for all our formal worship. It should therefore be treated accordingly. Slamming it about or banging on it is forbidden by reverent good taste.

"Finding the place" should be done as quietly as possible. When found, the passage to be read should be kept by a marker or the book left open. All necessary movements should be performed with quiet and decency.

Announcements.—The giving of announcements is a part of the service in practically all churches to-day, although the printed bulletin in many congregations takes a share of this. Announcements in church are not new in the history of public worship, for the Church of England in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI had a rubric calling for the priest to announce what holy days were to be kept, what marriage banns were to be published, etc. Of late, however, it has become customary in many churches for lay members to make the announcements rather than the ministry. This saves the minister for his purely spiritual leadership, and is more in keeping with the idea that temporal affairs should be administered by the laity. A point worth noting here is that when a printed bulletin is in use by a church and carries a program of announcements, any public reading of this is superfluous. It may sometimes be necessary, of course, to call attention to special matters deemed worthy of emphasis.

Since there is a stated time for announcements, these should be made then and not interspersed throughout other parts of the service. It is not wise to emphasize an announcement or repeat one just before the benediction. While the people's heads are bowed in quiet for the final blessing, such an announcement breaks into the peace in which they should be allowed to depart.

The Offering.—Taking an offering in church is another custom of great antiquity. A study of the evolution of the public church collection would be most interesting, but cannot be entered upon here. Suffice it to say that passing the plate has long been firmly intrenched as part of the service among American Protestant Churches. Some churches dislike the public passing of the plate and prefer other means of securing funds. Private subscriptions or even a box for contributions at the door of the church are sometimes substituted. When a public collection is taken it should be done quietly and efficiently. The laymen of the church usually have this matter in hand, and it seems more in keeping with the spirit of the offering for one of the laymen to supervise it and stand as representative of the church while it is being taken. Prayer over the offering, or the offertory chant, is a familiar part of the worship in many churches. The minister of course will know how to handle this matter. Let it be said here, however, that the offering in church is and should be a true part of the people's worship, and when carried out in that spirit becomes a blessing to the givers.

Dr. Lucius C. Clark[6] urges that the minister give

[6] "The Worshiping Congregation," p. 100.

as well as the people, meaning, we presume, that he with his people should publicly put his contribution in the receptacle for it.

The Sermon.—Concerning the sermon, what shall we say? For the time would fail to tell of the books and the pamphlets, the aids to sermonizing and the preacher's manuals, the preparation and delivery, the two hundred and fifteen outlines, the thirty thousand thoughts, the elocutioners, the orators, the pulpit spellbinders, and how to be like them. Many have labored and not a few have failed of the promise. Let us not encroach on this great field, but content ourselves with a few simple but important notes.

When a man preaches, let him be natural. No imitation of another, no cant, no "holy whine"—let every man be himself. If God has truly called him, he will have a message.

Cant is the bane of all genuine religious people. "Good Lord, deliver me from *cant*" was in one preacher's private litany. This is the way all sincere ministers feel, and so we think it unnecessary to do more than mention it here. A caution might be put in, however, that since the use or repetition of phrases which are meaningless to an outsider or casual hearer will sometimes lay a minister open to the charge of *cant*, he had best avoid such phraseology, no matter how well he understands it. This charge disappears when the genuine character of the man or of his message is known, but it always pays to speak in a tongue that the people can understand.

Someone asked Henry Ward Beecher what he thought of sensational preaching. He answered that he was against it, if by it was meant a low temporary

success by mere trickery, but if it meant "preaching which produced a sensation" he was for it. His meaning is clear—the gospel itself produces a tremendous sensation. "These that have turned the world upside down have come hither also." The Thessalonian Jews had it right—the world was, and always is, turned upside down by the preaching of the Cross. To that extent the minister must be a sensationalist. But the studied effort to supply people and press with sermons and opinions merely to cause comment or gain crowds is not only forsaking the highest ideals, it means trouble for the man himself. A preacher who starts out that way has got to "go himself one better" each Sunday. Bishop Warren A. Candler of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is quoted as saying: "He is like a dog with a can tied to his tail—he has got to run a little faster every minute to keep ahead of the can." There is enough truth in the gospel to provide all the sensation any man may consistently inaugurate and sustain, but claptrap methods and gaudy attempts to "catch the crowd" have but one end—they run out, and the best thing their promoter can do is to run out with them.

Personal mention in sermons should be carefully handled. There is an instinctive reverence for the preaching of the Word which the ages have taught people to feel, and that reverence it is not always wise to encroach upon by pulling in little details of local interest or adding personal allusions which are commonplace in the minds of the people. On the other hand, sometimes these local references are easily understood and serve to fasten the thought of the sermon in the minds of the hearers. It is a matter upon

which every man must judge with an individual evaluation each time. Jesus certainly dealt with everyday life. Personal allusions, however, or those narrating adventures and opinions of the speaker must be watched, lest the appearance of egotism be given. Most ministers of taste ask pardon of the audience when a reference to a personal experience is to be made or when some intimate picture of self be drawn. Of late years we do not hear this request for pardon so frequently, although personal narratives and opinions have by no means decreased. It ought, however, to be done and will serve the double purpose of gaining the good will of the audience and at the same time act as a check on a minister's too frequent use of such allusions. The calling of personal names, references to persons in the audience by name, etc., is not considered in good taste. In fact, in legislative bodies and all public assemblies of a formal sort, the use of names is avoided. It is "Mr. Chairman," or "The Gentleman from Mississippi," or "the chairman of the committee," not "Dr. Jones" or "Senator Smith." The same atmosphere of formality holds in public worship, and the "reading out in meeting" of private names is avoided where possible.

The use of non-classical allusions and slang ought also to be watched. Slang, since it is a linguistic outlaw, is all the more powerful, and many a minister to drive his point home in an unforgetable way sometimes resorts to it. Yet its use should be guarded, for like a whip to a horse, if it becomes habitual its power will be weakened and the antipathy felt toward it by the "purists" in the audience will overbalance its value as an effective instrument.

Scolding people, especially those present for those absent, is in bad taste if not bad temper. "You can't get bees in a field where there is no honey," commented Henry Ward Beecher anent this matter.

Correcting disorder so as to bring about greater disorder we have already seen condemned by Dr. John A. Kern. It should, however, be said that a minister will do well to see that his service of worship is treated with respect by all present. If disturbing noises outside the building can be eliminated by a request from the laymen of the church or by other authority, the minister is right in demanding that his people suffer no interruption from that source. Likewise when interruptions or disorder occur in the audience during the service or during his sermon he serves both his people and his message by seeing to it that this does not continue. The best plan is for the minister to stop preaching or stop the service until perfect quiet reigns, then go on. A pause of half a minute is usually sufficient. No comment need be made; just wait for quiet. It will not be long before the persons responsible will take the hint and either sit in quiet or cease to appear in that particular church. It is not well to make comments on such occasions. A certain evangelist once was heard to refer to a crying baby in the arms of its mother in such a way as to destroy the whole effect of his message in that place. A pause would have been more effective.

Plagiarism.—Taking a message of another and giving it as one's own is known as plagiarism. It is condemned by all ministers and defined differently by all. However, we believe that the honest minister will know when he takes what is in reality the work of

another. Although the codes cited herein have of course condemned plagiarism, it is the opinion of the writer that this sin is not as prevalent to-day as it once was. Ministers are better educated, they have been taught and that thoroughly to do their own thinking, and the wider reading of all people to-day makes plagiarism much harder to "get away with."[7]

The Closing Prayer.—The closing prayer in those churches which are accustomed to such is usually in line with the theme of the message. Daniel P. Kidder said it should be "devotional," following the sermon.

Benediction.—It is the custom to "let the people go" with a blessing that shall complete the service and that should perpetuate as much as possible the atmosphere of worship. An announcement repeated, or even much small talk, among the people, after the benediction is not good. Let the church be known as a sanctuary for the worship of God.

A Visiting Minister.—When a visiting minister or speaker is to take part in a regular service, it is customary for the minister in charge to introduce him to the audience. A simple yet gracious introduction is in much better taste than an effusive one. It is well to be explicit as to the initials and title of the visitor and to pronounce his name correctly. If there be any noteworthy fact about him which may commend him to the audience, this may be stated in brief words. Anything, however, savoring of eulogy or extravagant commendation had always best be avoided in intro-

[7] "It is unethical for the minister to use sermon material prepared by another without acknowledging the source from which it comes." (*Congregational Code*, I, 5. *Presbyterian* and *Methodist Codes* identical.)

ductions, in church and out. Let the speaker stand on his own merits and bring his own message.

When a speaker concludes an address or sermon it is always in good taste for the presiding minister to assume charge again quietly and give the order for the next part of the program. Comment by the presiding minister is risky and difficult. He cannot hope to speak at the point where the other man concluded, and he may mar the spirit under which the audience has been left if he attempts to comment on the message. He may show by his bearing better than his words his own feeling, and by quietly giving out the number of the concluding hymn, for instance, may add to, and not break, the spirit of the message. If the message has been a good one, the people know it and need not be told; and if it was poor they know that too, and the man who attempts to make them believe otherwise has a task on his hands. It is better, therefore, to refrain from comment after a speech or sermon.

CHAPTER VIII

OCCASIONAL SERVICES

THERE are certain occasional services in which every minister must engage. We can here take space for only two of them—funerals and weddings—for it would be impossible to outline the other occasional services for more than one denomination. The liturgical Churches rigidly prescribe in their printed offices the order which is to be followed by their ministers; the non-liturgical refuse to hold any printed form as binding. It may therefore seem somewhat presumptuous for us to suggest any procedure for funerals and marriages even in a broad and general way. Nevertheless there are moods and tempers as well as printed forms, and these the ministry, liturgical or not, instinctively follows. There are ways of procedure which cannot be caught by the letter of any service, and there are also customs and manners, details and overtones which agree amazingly in different Churches conducting the same rite. A marriage ceremony performed by a minister who "makes his own service" will not be so very different in tone from the stately procedure of the ancient Rite. The air of a funeral is everywhere the same, for death is a great leveler, in liturgics as well as everywhere else. Hence in taking up these two occasional services we shall attempt to outline approved practice in a general way, but with no idea of forcing liturgics upon the non-liturgical, or of attempting to supplant them for those who have their own forms and methods.

In the English Prayer Book the order for the burial of the dead comes just after the order for the solemnization of matrimony. The writer uses a ritual whose offices were taken from the Prayer Book, and it always struck him as just a bit ominous when he concluded the blessing upon a newly married pair to see across the page the fearful title: Order for the Burial of the Dead. So here we reverse this sequence and have the funeral first, the wedding bells afterwards.

The Funeral

A minister in charge of a funeral finds himself in one of the most difficult of situations. He represents God, under whose watch-care all events, even death, take place; he represents humanity in its efforts to assuage the bitterness of the hour; and at the same time he represents his own ecclesiastical organization, his own profession, in conducting a public service. The keynote of right conduct in all these various relationships will be found in quietness and a calm, assured attitude in both voice and bearing. Anything that breaks into the calm surety of the atmosphere will be a hindrance to the proper conduct of this service. This is the general guiding principle. Loud or strident tones, harsh singing, or even expressions which break in upon the peace of death should be carefully guarded against.

Church Funeral.—If the funeral be held in church, there is quite often a processional. The officiating minister meets the body at the church door as the pallbearers bring it up the steps. He may have been waiting in the pastor's room until the moment arrived, or he may have been forced to wait by the door while

the people gathered. His conduct on all such occasions should be quiet and reverent. There should be no unnecessary talking or movement on the part of anyone.

In the processional itself, the minister or ministers precede the body down the aisle while one of them reads such words as his Church may provide for the occasion, or as he himself selects. When processional sentences are read, this should be done in a distinct but not overly loud tone. The reading should cease about the time the body is placed before the altar or pulpit or "chancel rail." The minister has, of course, gone on into the pulpit or wherever he is to stand during the service. When several ministers are present, they march by two in the procession, and the one who reads the sentences goes in front of all.

As to Psalms, lessons, Scripture readings, etc., not much may be suggested here. The occasion calls not for trumpet blasts in the readings and prayers, but for the quiet and soothing pronouncement of the magnificent words which from time immemorial have been the consolation of the bereaved. As different Churches have different selections, no more may be said at this point.

Where extempore prayer forms part of the funeral service the minister will wish to be more careful of his words in this than in any other formal prayer. He must not wound the feelings and susceptibilities of the grief-stricken, nor must he do violence to his own conceptions of the providence of God. Usually, even the non-liturgical ministers gradually evolve in their recurrent ministration their own "funeral prayer," and this with minor variations they repeat at each

funeral. A truly sympathetic pastor will have no trouble in suiting himself to each occasion of this sort. Dr. Charles R. Brown advises that the funeral prayer should not be too long.[1]

Concerning singing at funerals, it may be said that such hymns as are used must, of course, be in keeping with the occasion. A few well-trained voices are much better—a quartet, for instance—than a large number of singers. The whole program for a formal funeral should be worked out carefully beforehand, and a number of copies of the program may well be made out and given to those who are to take part. Then when a hymn is to be sung, the minister in charge, with a nod to the choir, may so indicate. Likewise the other ministers who have been asked to take part will the more easily fulfill their duty at the designated time without need of spoken announcement. This makes for a more orderly and reverent service than would harsh announcements.

Funeral sermons are rapidly passing. Even the non-liturgical Churches are using more and more some sort of printed office. The practice of preaching funeral sermons came to its full strength years ago in the evangelical Churches of America, and became such an institution that in many places the custom is too strong to be fought. It led, of course, to absurdities and abuses. The preacher who never got a chance at certain individuals had them where he wanted them at funerals, and often felt it his duty to preach to and harangue them. This to-day does not impress the consciousness of the ministry as a manly procedure.

[1] "The Making of a Minister," p. 207.

The hunter who takes a "pot shot" at a bird is ruled out as a poor sport, and the suspicion is in many minds that the minister who takes advantage of the presence of death to force upon unwilling people his own beliefs is not far different.

Another abuse of funeral sermons was formerly to be found in the encomiums which the minister felt called upon to pass upon the character of the dead. Such praise ofttimes came close to a judgment of the whole life, and was so taken in the popular mind. *De mortuis nihil nisi bonum*,[2] said the Romans; but compromise, as we repeat here, must not be in a minister's life. He wishes, of course, to comfort the bereaved, but more and more the majestic but impersonal phrases of the burial service are seen to be better than the attempt to steer between the Sylla of family grief and the Charybdis of the majesty of the judgment of God. Watching this dangerous feat of navigation and inwardly commenting on it are always to be found an array of persons who knew the late lamented better than the officiating minister. Let the minister stick to the printed form when he may. "Eschew all estimates of the character of the departed," advises Dr. Gladden; "the simple annals of the life, time, and place of birth, family record, date of death may be simply stated from memoranda furnished by the family." This will serve as good advice for those occasions when one has to speak over the dead. If anything else be called for, let it be in the nature of generalities for which one may need no repentance.

Broadus, along the same line, suggested that when a funeral sermon is called for, all that is said must be

[2] "Nothing but good about the dead."

"*scrupulously true*, though not necessarily *all* the truth, for this would often be superfluous and sometimes painful."[3] He advises that when the departed was a Christian that fact may be stressed. Broadus truly observes that on funeral occasions some preachers "give the lie to all their ordinary preaching."

The Funeral Rite in church is generally closed by the statement, "The service will be continued at the cemetery"; or, in the case of a private interment, a mention of that fact. The ministers then leave the pulpit and precede the coffin up the aisle in a slow procession. The people should quietly stand and wait until the family, following the pallbearers, have left the church. In the meanwhile, the ministers have preceded the body to the hearse, where they stand while the casket is being put in place. When the doors of the funeral car are closed upon the casket they may then seek the places provided for them in the funeral procession.

During an outdoor processional and at the interment itself, it is almost instinctive for men to remove their hats and thus honor the dead. This is an agreeable custom in pleasant weather, but we have never felt that the living ought to be jeopardized for the dead. Dr. Gladden agrees here and states that the men should be admonished to keep their hats on, meaning, of course, when the weather is cold or inclement. Ministers quite often say to the pallbearers, "Let us keep our hats on, gentlemen," and set the example. Sometimes the hand may be put to the hat brim in a semi-military way and thus give the desired expression of respect.

"[3] The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons," p. 102.

The minister or ministers continue to precede the body toward the grave by going in front of the hearse. This matter is directed by the undertaker.

Home Funeral.—The funeral service at the house has become of late years much more common than the church funeral. It may be conducted along the same lines as described above, but is somewhat less formal. The same hints, however, as to a program prepared in advance may well be taken. The minister usually finds out ahead whether he is expected to use his own car or whether the undertaker will send for him. In the latter case (and it is the one which entails less trouble) it is best to arrange to get to the home very near the appointed hour. While the undertaker is in actual charge of all arrangements, it is the minister who is popularly thought of as being in control. He should conduct himself accordingly. It does no good to stand about the home for a considerable time before the service begins.

Often when the minister arrives the members of the family ask to see him. In most cases the minister finds that some special request or some final wishes are then made known. Occasionally he is called upon to speak to the sorrowing for the purpose of consolation. In such cases he does the best he can; but unless he is specially requested to seek the family, it will be found wiser to wait until after the funeral to see and comfort them. Before the service the people of the house are keyed up for the ordeal, guests are present, sometimes curious onlookers, and this sometimes forces an artificiality on the part of the home people. The writer has in a few instances seen relatives whose grief was partially assumed. They felt that every one

expected them to show how much they cared for the loved one by "carrying on"—and carry on they would. If the widow Smith across the way showed her grief when her old man died, it is now up to the widow Jones to show hers, and she fully intends to go Mrs. Smith one better. Ministers occasionally stumble into a situation of this sort. It sometimes happens in such cases that people who enjoy loosing the emotions really work themselves up into hysterics, or faints, and the minister is sent to labor with such persons. If he diagnose this situation rightly, he can, by prompt and firm—not to say stern—words, call for peace, and get it too. "Among rude, untaught, excitable people," says Dr. Charles R. Brown, "these expressions of grief may readily carry them over into something hysterical. The minister is there to induce a calmer, saner, more Christian way of facing death."[4] Of course, sometimes a genuine and deep grief calls for and extorts expression. It is then that God only can help, and upon him his minister must lean in these moments.

At the Grave.—When the funeral party arrives at the cemetery, the minister should go at once to the hearse, where he stands as a sort of guard while the flowers are being taken to the grave and other preparations made. When the procession starts he, of course, precedes the body to the grave and takes his station while the casket is "made ready to be lowered."

The prayers and readings given in the open air may be spoken in a stronger way than within a building, but the tone of quiet firmness should not be dropped.

---

[4] "The Making of a Minister," p. 203.

The committal was formerly objected to as savoring of a priestly commendation. The Presbyterians for a long time would have nothing resembling it, and John Wesley, when he gave a Prayer Book to American Methodism in 1784, deleted the committal from his office for the burial of the dead. Methodism, however, in the middle of the nineteenth century replaced the committal in the burial service, and many manuals in use among Presbyterian preachers call for this ceremony if desired. Dr. Gladden states that the English committal service is almost identical with that employed in German Lutheran churches and is always appropriate. There seems to be no special objection to it to-day in Protestantism. The wording, even in the Prayer Book, has been so altered that no warrant may be found for the statement that commendation implies any more than does the whole ceremony of Christian burial.

Some ministers object to the "ashes to ashes, dust to dust" expression in the time-honored committal. The ground of their objection is that the previous service has been one of hope, yet now, so they say, clods are thrown on the coffin and the ominous words, "Earth to earth," etc., "bring our heavenly thoughts down to earth with a shudder and we go away with a heavy sense of having left our dear ones in the cold ground." The spirit of this objection may be understood, and so let each man do as seemeth good; but after all, death is death and all efforts to blink the stark reality of that fact fall far short of the thing itself.

Fraternal Orders.—When a fraternal order is to have a part in a funeral. such part should be clearly under-

stood beforehand by all participants, including the minister. When the family places the funeral in the hands of a minister, this gives him the right to order the ceremonies as he pleases, but he, of course, will wish to be as considerate as possible of any others who are also to take part. The tactful minister will have no trouble in making the lodge or other organization feel that it has a really essential part of the services. We have known only one master of a lodge who was afraid the minister would "put over" something on him. All good fraternity men are easy to work with—that is why they are good fraternity men—and there will scarcely ever come any conflict over the management of details. But let the minister have a complete understanding ahead of time.

Matrimony

Marriage is a rite which from time immemorial has been esteemed a religious one. In ancient times the priest or minister was the sole judge as to who might be married, for there was no State license as at present. The priest or clergyman proclaimed "the banns" in public for a specified period, so that if there should chance to be any objection on the part of anyone, this might be stated and evaluated beforehand. If no objection was brought, and if the proposed marriage was in accord with the laws of his Church, the priest or minister would then marry the couple. In all cases the priest was the judge as to the right of matrimony.

Now, however, the State has come in and the minister is no longer under the necessity of acting as a court to ascertain and proclaim the right of marriage

between persons. The State's license now clears the minister of civil obligations, but he is not clear of his own responsibility in this matter. The large denominations have made regulations governing the conduct of their ministers, but it may be said that the only situation in which the matter becomes acute to-day is in the remarriage of certain classes of divorced persons. Whatever be the denominational regulations, it is well for every minister to look carefully into the actual state of things before he marries any divorcee. Some make it a rule to ask the parties for all documents bearing on the case; others ask them plainly for the facts. Some ministers refuse to remarry any divorced person, no matter what may be the attendant circumstances; others will marry the "innocent party," provided that the case is clear.

The State cannot force a minister to marry a couple against his will. Its license is an authorization for him to act if he so wishes. When a minister, therefore, marries a couple he may not escape responsibility for his act by saying that if he does not perform that ceremony another minister will. This is simply to recall the Master's "It must needs be that offenses come" and to forget the latter half of that pronouncement.[5]

A minister need not feel hesitant in stating to a couple that he is not at liberty to marry them. Should the law of his Church forbid, he may give this as his excuse; should his own conscience also forbid, he may, if he feels it the part of manhood, give his personal

[5] "The minister should be careful not to bring reproach on his calling by joining in marriage improper persons." (*Congregational Code*, I, 7. *Methodist Code* identical.)

reasons. He should be courteous, but the sanctity of the marriage rite should be so highly esteemed in his own mind that he will not have it degenerate into a mere formula for a fee.[6]

The minister will do well to remember that he is regarded as master of ceremonies at every wedding occasion. Until he has pronounced the final blessing all must wait upon him. We cite this not to present the minister as one who is in a class with the bride in public regard, or even the groom, but to make clear his responsiblity until he finishes his part. He should not let the occasion "get away from him." While the time is always one of gaiety, especially in a home wedding, anything like lightness and levity on the part of the minister, particularly before the service, will detract much from the dignity of his office.

The minister is expected to be an authority on everything connected with a wedding and is often referred to for advice as to minor points in the ceremony. So he may find it advisable to get hold of some authoritative work, such as Mrs. Burton Kingsland's "The Book of Weddings," or something along the line of the "Blue Book." Here we shall not attempt to do more than give an outline of the minister's part in a general way.

A minister should be apprised early that his services are to be required for a contemplated wedding. Mrs. Kingsland suggests that the bride-to-be may, in a gracious way, inform her minister by a note that he is to be asked to marry her at a certain date and hour

[6] "The minister is not under obligations to marry every couple that comes to him to be married. The power of refusal, however, should be exercised with great discretion." (*Unitarian Code*, V, 1.)

and express the hope that he will be able to officiate. This will give him the opportunity to make his plans for the occasion. The groom is expected to call upon the minister a short time before the wedding day and complete the arrangements. The groom is also supposed to provide a conveyance for the minister when he must go some distance to the church or home; but to-day, as most ministers have their own cars, the offer of the groom is frequently refused with thanks. Mrs. Kingsland tells us that when there are to be two or more ministers taking part in the service, the "carriage" should first call for the lower ranking clergyman, then for the higher.

A Church Wedding.—The church has been for ages the place where matrimony is solemnized. In England, we are told, marriages rarely take place elsewhere. In our own country the home wedding is quite frequent, but most formal weddings are solemnized within a church. The church of the bride is the proper place for her wedding, even though she expects to leave it afterwards for that of her husband.

An examination of the marriage license by the minister ought always to precede final preparation for the wedding, if for no other reason than to see that the form is made out properly. Where the parties are well known to the minister he need not be as careful in this matter as he must be when he faces perfect strangers; but carefulness always pays.

It will be supposed that the ushers have managed their duties well, that the wedding party has arrived at the anteroom of the church where the bridesmaids are throwing off wraps and putting the finishing touches upon their costumes and that of the bride.

In the meanwhile, the minister with the groom and best man are in the vestry room or pastor's room awaiting the opening chord of the organ. At the proper moment the sexton throws wide the doors for the wedding party, the organist peals forth the wedding march, and the minister, leaving the vestry room, walks slowly to take his place within the chancel facing the audience. He is followed at a short interval by the groom and the best man, who stand at the minister's left, half turned, watching for the entrance of the bride. The minister should remember that the entire group form upon him—that is, with respect to his station—and his position is thus a guide to that of the others. When the bride arrives on the arm of her father, the groom usually takes a step or so to meet her, she releases her father's arm and puts her hand in that of the groom, and both take their places before the minister. He in turn advances a step toward them, "book in hand." The bride's father steps back to his place with the family, the bridesmaids and groomsmen "close in" a slight bit, and the ceremony begins.

Ministers usually have their own manuals, rituals, or Prayer Books directing them in the proper conduct of the marriage rite, and even ministers of those denominations which do not prescribe any fixed office gradually evolve for themselves a regular form which they use at each recurrent service. The usual ceremony, however, is that based upon the Office for the Solemnization of Matrimony as ordered by the Prayer Book of the Church of England. The Protestant Episcopal Church in America has retained this office with some changes in the interest of brevity and delicacy of expression, neither of which was very pro-

nounced in the old Prayer Book. The same office slightly abridged was transmitted to the Methodist Episcopal Church in America by John Wesley in his famous "Sunday Service" or Methodist Liturgy of 1784. This ancient office thus became the rite for a large group of American church people, and has been the base of nearly all revised or individually evolved services. Dr. Lloyd C. Douglas commends this ancient rite as the only one. "You will find," he said, "that all these home-brewed rituals lack a great deal of the dignity, power, and charm of the service to which I have referred." Hence in our outline of the marriage service in the following pages we are going to trace the successive steps of the ancient and august ceremony.

From time immemorial the position of the man and woman when they are standing before the minister has been the same, "the man on the right of the woman and the woman on the left of the man." This means that the woman is upon the right of the minister and the man to his left as he faces the couple.

The address with which this office opens is a general one and should be spoken to the entire assemblage in a sure yet gracious way. It is usually considered best for the minister to hold his ritual, manual, or Prayer Book in his hand and make occasional reference to it. He should be most familiar with the service and able if need be to repeat it from memory, but the book itself seems to give a something of official dignity and sanction to his act. Dean Charles R. Brown does not agree to this entirely, for he says in advising that the marriage ceremony be learned by heart: "The impressiveness of a marriage ceremony is greatly

increased where the minister does not have to be looking back and forth from John and Mary to the pages of a book or glancing occasionally from the book into the faces of the bride and groom."[7] It is true that the minister had best not read entirely from the printed page, but many ministers hold that the office lacks something if the officiating clergyman goes before the couple minus his book.

There is a challenge in the general address of the ancient office demanding that if any can show cause why "they may not lawfully be joined together, let him now speak," etc. Since this is a sweeping challenge, it should be addressed in a general way to all.

A challenge to the parties next follows. As this is to the couple only, the voice and look of the officiating minister are directed to them in a more personal way as he inquires if they "do know any impediment" why they "may not be lawfully joined together."

Since no reply is anticipated, the minister at once goes into the espousal. This is the familiar, "Wilt thou have this woman to thy wedded wife?" etc. The "given names" of the parties are used here: "John, wilt thou have this woman?" "Mary, wilt thou have this man?" Dr. Lloyd C. Douglas advises calling the man by the name which is familiar to his associates, even though this name be not his given name. Thus we suppose if Aloysius Percival Smith, whom everybody calls "Percy," is entering the holy estate of matrimony, Dr. Douglas would advise the minister to call him "Percy" and not pull "Aloysius" out of the family archives for the occasion.

---

[7] "The Making of a Minister," p. 196.

Anciently the espousal or espousals preceded the marriage, sometimes by years. They corresponded in medieval times to what we now should term "engagement." The espousal is the mutual promise and expression of willingness on the part of each person to take the other, and "keep only unto him" so long as both shall live.

Next in the ancient office comes the ceremony known as "giving away the bride," or in more formal language, the "giving into marriage of the woman." The father or nearest male relative usually performs this service, though his participation is generally confined to escorting the bride to the groom. This ceremony was discussed in a letter to a recent periodical by one who took the position that it was an outgrowth of the old custom of coemption, or the buying of the bride by the groom, and that the modern father when he "gives his daughter in marriage" is still following the implications of this ancient practice. This position was assailed by a Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as we recall, who took issue in a subsequent number of the periodical in question and stated that the father does not give his daughter to the man, but *to be married* to the man. He gives her to the Church represented by the clergyman, who in turn marries her to the man. The Bishop's position is sound. The old York Rite had: "*Deinde sacerdos*, Who gyves me this wyfe?" The "wife" was given the priest, who married her to the man.[8]

At this point there begins, technically speaking, the actual marriage itself. The espousals, or mutually

[8] "Rites and Ritual of Episcopal Methodism," Harmon, p. 252.

expressed wishes to marry the other party, have been heard, the father has given away the bride, now the actual marriage begins. In line with this idea it has long been the custom of the priests of the Church of England to turn at this point and lead the couple from the floor of the church up the steps nearer the altar, where the rest of the rite takes place. None of the others save the best man and maid of honor accompany the couple, and these not always. The less liturgical Churches in America have no facilities for this symbolic approach to the altar, as the "chancel rail" in such churches has no gate or opening, nor is there an altar arranged as in English or Protestant Episcopal Churches. Hence in non-liturgical Churches the entire ceremony takes place before the chancel rail.

The betrothal, which is the next step, consists in a symbolic taking of hands and the repetition by each party of a betrothal speech: "I, John, take thee, Mary," etc. The printed rubrics or general practice of each Church governs in this matter, but it is often convenient for the minister himself to join the hands and, if he chooses, keep his own hand lightly upon the clasped hands of the bridal pair while they are "plighting troth." In outlining the respective speeches of the couple here, as well as in the "ring ceremony," the minister had best proceed by short phrases, rather than long ones.

The wedding, or "ring ceremony," is a very ancient part of the marriage rite. In medieval times the ring was blessed by the priest after the man had said, "With this ringe I the wed and this gold and siluer I the geue and With my body I the Worshipe and With all my

worldly cathel I the endowe," and then had put the ring upon the woman's *thumb* saying, "In the Name of the Father"; and then on the *secundo digito* (second finger) saying, "and of the Son"; and then on the third finger saying, "and of the Holy Ghost," and then upon the fourth finger saying, "Amen." (See Use of Sarum.) Because of the blessing of the ring as done in medieval times the Puritans objected bitterly to the ring ceremony, and the old Presbyterian Directory appeared without it. John Wesley also removed the ring ceremony from the Marriage Rite which he transmitted to American Methodism in his "abridgment" of the Prayer Book, and it has not been until recently that Methodist Episcopal Churches have replaced this ceremony in their respective rituals. To-day, however, most non-liturgical ministers have no scruples against the ceremony, even where their own service books may not include it. It is in reality a beautiful and symbolic act. In this ceremony the minister again "teaches" (outlines) the words the man must say. It may be interesting to observe that the name "wedding," which properly belongs only to this ceremony, has been generalized to mean in modern parlance the entire marriage rite. As may be gathered above, for a long time the Presbyterians and Methodists solemnized many a *marriage* that was not a *wedding*.

The wedding prayer follows. It is quite often customary, where there is more than one minister, to assign this prayer to the one who is to assist in the service. Mrs. Kingsland states that the "plighting of the troth" (betrothal) is usually assigned to the minister to whom one would show the most honor,

though we should imagine that the wedding ought also to be included as a part of high honor.

After the wedding prayer there is a symbolic joining of hands again. A great many ministers at this point also prefer to clasp together the joined hands of the couple as they pronounce, "Those whom God hath joined together, let not man put asunder," and then proclaim to all the fact of the marriage: "Forasmuch as John and Mary have consented," etc.

The couple usually kneel for a final blessing by the minister, which he may give with uplifted hands.

When they arise, the minister may congratulate the newly married pair if he so choose, provided that he do so in such a gracious way that the solemnity of the service which he has just concluded will not be impaired. Then the organ peals out the march, and the party goes out in reverse order from that in which it entered. The minister withdraws to his room immediately after the ceremony.

Home Wedding.—A home wedding may be made almost as formal as one in a church if so desired. "Some semblance of a chancel, flowery bower, or canopy is arranged at the end of the room reserved for the ceremony." The minister usually prefers to keep himself in seclusion somewhat until time for the marriage. Generally a room is assigned to him and other gentlemen guests of the groom. He should give himself enough time in advance to examine the license and arrange last-minute details with the parties.

At the appointed moment he takes his station at the designated place. The couple with attendants, etc., come in with a formal march, or in a less formal

way if they have so decided. The details of the service as outlined in the church wedding may act as a guide here. Quite often it is arranged to have a reception for the bride and groom immediately after the ceremony in the home; and when this is the case the minister, after congratulating the couple, yields his place to them. They turn to face the company and the congratulations are on.

Minor details connected with a minister's official work, such as filling out the marriage license, etc., may be attended to in a careful way after the ceremony. A much less formal atmosphere is felt in the home after the wedding, and the minister usually feels himself free to drop somewhat his official manner toward the affair and enter into the spirit of the occasion as any gentleman might.

APPENDIX

As an appendix to this volume we reprint the complete codes which are to be found as separate items through the foregoing work. We have already given in our preface the various publications in which these codes may be found.

THE CONGREGATIONAL CODE

(Adopted by the New Haven (Conn.) Association of Congregational Ministers.)

I. 1. As a minister controls his own time, he should make it a point of honor to give full service to his parish.

I. 2. Part of the minister's service as a leader of his people is to reserve sufficient time for serious study in order thoroughly to apprehend his message, keep abreast of current thought, and develop his intellectual and spiritual capacities.

I. 3. It is equally the minister's duty to keep physically fit. A weekly holiday and an annual vacation should be taken and used for rest and improvement.

I. 4. As a public interpreter of divine revelation and human duty the minister should tell the truth as he sees it and present it tactfully and constructively.

I. 5. It is unethical for the minister to use sermon material prepared by another without acknowledging the source from which it comes.

I. 6. As an ethical leader in the community, it is incumbent on the minister to be scrupulously honest, avoid debts, and meet his bills promptly.

I. 7. The minister should be careful not to bring reproach on his calling by joining in marriage improper persons.

II. 1. It is unethical for a minister to break his contract, made with the Church.

II. 2. As a professional man the minister should make his service primary and the remuneration secondary. His efficiency, however, demands that he should receive a salary adequate to the work he is

expected to do and commensurate with the scale of living in that parish which he serves.

II. 3. It is unethical for the minister to engage in other lines of remunerative work without the knowledge and consent of the Church or its official board.

II. 4. The confidential statements made to a minister by his parishioners are privileged and should never be divulged without the consent of those making them.

II. 5. It is unethical for a minister to take sides with factions in his parish.

II. 6. The minister recognizes himself to be the servant of the community in which he resides. Fees which are offered should be accepted only in the light of this principle.

III. 1. It is unethical for a minister to interfere directly or indirectly with the parish work of another minister; especially should he be careful to avoid the charge of proselyting.

III. 2. Ministerial service should not be rendered to the members of another parish without consulting the minister of that parish.

III. 3. It is unethical for a minister to make overtures to or consider overtures from a church whose pastor has not yet resigned.

III. 4. It is unethical for a minister to speak ill of the character or work of another minister, especially of his predecessor or successor. It is the duty of a minister, however, in flagrant cases of unethical conduct, to bring the matter before the proper body.

III. 5. As members of the same profession and brothers in the service of a common Master, the relation between ministers should be one of frankness and coöperation.

METHODIST MINISTERS' ETHICAL CODE

(Adopted by a group of Methodist ministers meeting in conference at Rockford, Ill., and found printed in the *Christian Century*, December 16, 1926.)

When a Methodist minister becomes a member of Conference he promises to employ all his time in the work of God. We again call attention to the fact that he is thus honor bound to give full service to his parish.

Part of the minister's service as a leader of his people is to reserve sufficient time for serious study in order thoroughly to appreciate his message, keep abreast of current thought, and develop his intellectual and spiritual capacities.

It is equally the minister's duty to keep physically fit. A weekly holiday and an annual vacation should be taken and used for rest and improvement.

As a public interpreter of divine revelation and human duty, the minister should tell the truth as he sees it and present it tactfully and constructively.

It is unethical for the minister to use sermon material prepared by another without acknowledging the source from which it comes.

As an ethical leader in the community, it is incumbent on the minister to be scrupulously honest, avoid debt, and meet his bills promptly.

The minister should be careful not to bring reproach upon his calling by joining in marriage improper persons.

As a professional man the minister should make his service primary and the remuneration secondary. This implies a salary, paid regularly, and adequate to the work he is expected to do and commensurate with the scale of living in that parish where he serves.

The confidential statements made to a minister by his parishioners are privileged and should never be divulged without the consent of those making them.

In the making of conference reports, it is unethical for a minister to report other than the actual salary received.

The minister recognizes himself to be the servant of the community in which he resides. Fees which are offered should be accepted only in the light of this principle.

It is unethical for a minister to interfere directly or indirectly with the parish work of another minister; especially should he be careful to avoid the charge of proselyting.

"Ministerial service should not be rendered to the members of another parish without consulting the minister of the parish, or by invitation from him.

"It is unethical for a minister to speak ill of the character or work of another minister, especially of his predecessor or successor. It is the duty of a minister, however, in flagrant cases of unethical conduct, to bring the matter before the proper body.

"It is unethical for a minister on leaving a charge to leave the parsonage property in other than in first-class condition, with all dirt, rubbish, etc., removed. Common courtesy to his successor demands the observance of the golden rule.

"As members of the same profession and brothers in the service of a common Master, the relation between ministers should be one of frankness, of comradeship, and of coöperation."

THE PRESBYTERIAN CODE

(Reported as adopted by the Presbytery of New York and printed in an article by William H. Leach in *The Methodist Quarterly Review*, July, 1927.)

I. Personal Standards

1. As a minister controls his own time, he should make it a point of honor to give full service to his parish.

2. Part of a minister's service as a leader of his people is to reserve sufficient time for serious study in order to thoroughly apprehend his message, keep abreast of current thought, and develop his intellectual and spiritual capacities.

3. It is equally the minister's duty to keep physically fit. A weekly holiday and an annual vacation should be taken and used for rest and improvement.

4. It is unethical for a minister to use sermon material prepared by another, without acknowledging the source from which it comes.

5. As an ethical leader in the community, it is incumbent on the minister to be scrupulously honest, avoid debts, and meet his bills promptly.

II. Relations with the Parish

1. In accepting a pastorate, a minister assumes obligations which he should faithfully perform until released in the constitutional manner.

2. As a professional man, the minister should make his service primary and the remuneration secondary.

3. A minister should not regularly engage in other kinds of remunerative work, except with the knowledge and consent of the official board of the Church.

4. The confidential statements made to a minister by his parishioners are sacred and not to be divulged.

5. As a minister is especially charged to study the peace and unity of the Church, it is unwise as well as unethical for a minister to take sides with any faction in his Church, in any but exceptional cases.

6. The minister is the servant of the community and not only of

his Church, and should find in the opportunity for general ministerial service a means of evidencing the Christian spirit.

III. Relations with the Profession

1. It is unethical for a minister to interfere directly or indirectly with the parish work of another minister; especially should he be careful to avoid the charge of proselyting from a sister Church.

2. Except in emergencies, ministerial service should not be rendered to the members of another parish without the knowledge of the minister of the parish.

3. A minister should not make overtures to or consider overtures from a Church whose pastor has not yet resigned.

4. It is unethical for a minister to speak ill of the character or work of another minister, especially of his predecessor or successor. It is the duty of a minister, however, in cases of flagrant misconduct to bring the matter before the proper body.

5. A minister should be very careful to protect his brother ministers from imposition by unworthy applicants for aid, and should refer such cases to established charitable agencies rather than to send them to other Churches.

6. A minister should be scrupulously careful in giving indorsements to agencies or individuals unless he has a thorough knowledge and approval of their work lest such indorsements be used to influence others unduly.

7. As members of the same profession and brothers in the service of a common Master, the relation between ministers should be one of frankness and coöperation.

UNITARIAN MINISTERS' CODE OF ETHICS

(Adopted by the Unitarian Ministerial Union and found printed in the August, 1926, number of *Church Management.*)

I. 1. The minister should always place service above profit, avoiding the suspicion of an inordinate love of money, and never measuring his work by his salary.

I. 2. He should be conscientious in giving full time and strength to the work of his Church, engaging in avocations and other occupations in such a way and to such a degree as not to infringe unduly upon that work unless some definite arrangement for part-time service is made with his Church.

I. 3. The minister should count it a most important part of his work to keep in touch with the best religious thought of his day, and should make it a point of honor to set aside sufficient time for reading and study.

I. 4. It is the minister's duty to keep himself in as good physical condition as possible.

I. 5. The minister should set a high moral standard of speech and conduct. He should be scrupulous in the prompt payment of bills, and careful in the incurring of financial obligations.

I. 6. The minister should never speak disparagingly of his Church or his profession.

II. 1. The minister's relation to his parish is a sacred contract, which should not be terminated by him, or broken by his resignation, without at least three months' notice, except by special agreement.

II. 2. The minister is the recognized leader of the parish, but he should not assume authority in Church affairs which is not expressly granted to him by the terms of his contract, or the usage of his office, or the vote of his Church.

II. 3. The minister rightfully controls his own pulpit, but he should not invite persons into it who are not generally acceptable to the parish, and he should be ready to cacede to all reasonable requests by responsible Church officials for its use.

III. 1. The minister should remember that he is pastor of all his people. He should avoid the display of preferences, and the cultivation of intimacies within the parish which may be construed as evidence of partiality. He should not attach himself to any social set either in the Church or in the community. He should not allow personal feelings to interfere with the impartial nature of his ministrations.

III. 2. In the case of parish controversy, the minister should maintain an attitude of good will to all, even when he himself is the subject of controversy.

III. 3. It is unethical to divulge the confidences of parishioners without their consent.

III. 4. Professional service should be gladly rendered to all, without regard to compensation, except for necessary expenses incurred.

IV. 1. It is unethical for a minister to render professional service within the parish of another minister, or to occupy another minister's pulpit, without the consent of that minister whenever obtainable, and this consent should be given readily.

IV. 2. He should be very careful not to proselytize among the members of another Church.

IV. 3. He should discourage all overtures from a Church whose minister has not yet resigned.

IV. 4. He should always speak with good will of another minister, especially of the minister who has preceded or followed him in a parish. It may be his duty, however, to bring to the attention of the responsible officials of the fellowship any instance of gross professional or personal misconduct that may injure the good name of the ministry.

IV. 5. The minister should be very generous in responding to reasonable requests for assistance from his brother ministers and his denominational officials, remembering that he is one of a larger fellowship.

IV. 6. It is his duty to show a friendly and coöperative interest in his brethren, attending the group meetings of the ministers, assisting his brother ministers with labors of love, defending them against injustice, and following them with kindly concern in their hours of need or distress.

IV. 7. He should never accept from a brother minister fees for professional services, at christenings, weddings, and funerals.

V. 1. The minister is not under obligations to marry every couple that comes to him to be married. The power of refusal, however, should be exercised with great discretion.

V. 2. The minister's responsibility to the State is that of a citizen. He should, therefore, be faithful to his public obligations, and should respond to reasonable requests for assistance in community work.

NOTE

The Greek word found on page 127 is thus rendered by the dictionary:

Ταπεινοφροσύνη, ης, ἡ. Lowliness of mind, humility, "Not the making of one's self small when he is really great, but thinking little of one's self because this is in a sense the right estimate for any human being, however great."—*R. C. Trench's Synonyms (adapted).*

INDEX

"*Æquinimitas*" quoted, 93.
Aged, the, 99.
Agents, treatment of, 108.
Ames, Bishop, quoted, 10.
Announcements, 139.
Applicants for aid, 29.
Arrival in new charge, 68.
"Ashes to ashes," 155.
Atmosphere of worship, 128.
Augustine, St., opinion of, 24.
Avocations (note), 26.

Ballot, the, 56.
Barstow, Rev. Henry H., quoted, 101.
Batten, Rev. S. Z., 13, 66.
Beecher, Rev. Henry Ward, 87.
Benediction, the, 145.
Bills, to be paid promptly, 44.
Books, a minister's, 39.
Breaking contract (note), 124.
Brent, Bishop, quoted, 63.
Broadus quoted, 151.
Brown, Dr. Charles R., quoted, 150.

Calling, pastoral, 85.
Calling *vs.* Profession, 8.
Candidature, 121.
Candler, Bishop W. A., quoted, 37, 75, 142.
Cant, 141.
Cardinal Mercier, 24.
Charity cases, 105.
Christian ministry, 17.
Civic service, 52.
Civic status, 51.
Chaplains, 52, 53.
Church funeral, 148.
Church Management quoted, 14.
Church property, 74, 119.
Church wedding, 159.
Clausen, Dr. Bernard, quoted, 86.
Clergy fares, 47.
Comment upon sermon, 146.
Committal, the, 155.
Community work (note), 57.
Conduct unbecoming a gentleman, 19.
Confessions, 104.
Confidences privileged, 105.
Conflicts with other Churches, 83.
Congregational Code, 12, 169.
Consciousness, ministerial, 66.
Contagious diseases, 97.
Correcting disorder, 144.
Correspondence with former members, 77.
Criticism of Church, 113.
Death, 99, 101.
Debts, 44.

Denominational courtesy, 80, 81.
Diaconate, origin of, 106.
Discount, ministerial, 45.
Divorce and remarriage, 157.
Doubtful questions, 112.

Douglas, Dr. Lloyd C., quoted, 92.
Dress, 49.
Dying persons, 98.

Expediency, 21.

Fakes, 107.
Family life, 40.
Fees, 48, 49.
Finances, Church, 118.
Financial transactions, 27.
Financial irregularity, 44.
Foote, Dr. Henry Wilder, quoted, 66, 102.
Former pastors, 71, 76.
Fraternal Orders at funerals, 155.
Funeral, the, 148.
Funeral arrangements, 100.
Funeral prayer, the, 149.
Funeral sermons, 150.

Galloway, Bishop Charles B., quoted, 13, 68, 69, 70, 73.
Garb, clerical, 49.
Gentleman and Christian, 7.
Generalization, 63.
"Given names," 162.
Giving in marriage, 163.
Gladden, Dr. Washington, quoted, 120, 151.
Gossiping, 91, 92.

Heterodoxy, 112.
Hillis, Dr. Newell D., quoted, 28.
Home duties, 41.
Home funeral, 153.
Home wedding, 166.
Hospital amenities, 96.
Humor, at other's expense, 92.
Hymns and music, 134.
Hysteria at funerals, 154

Invitations to other Churches, 78.

Jefferson, Dr. Charles, quoted, 128.
Jury duty for ministers, 56.

Leach, Dr. W. H., quoted, 125.
Leaving a room, 94.
Lee, Gen. Robert E., 29.
Lending money, 106.
License, the marriage, 157.
Literary Digest quoted, 28.
Local rivalry, 83.

Matrimony, 156.
Medical ethics, 30.
Members of other Churches, 81.
Mental life, 38.
Methodist Code, 12, 170.
Military exemption, 57.
Minister and his Church, 109.
Ministerial citizenship, 56.
Ministerial credentials, 110.
Ministerial discount, 45.
Ministerial relations, 66.
Minister's name, the, 29.
Minister's wife, 42.
Misconduct, ministerial (note), 71.
Money, Church, 120.
Money (note), 26.
Moral questions, 61.
Murder trials, 50.

Needy cases, 107.
New minister, duty to, 79.

Offering, 140.
Osler, Dr., quoted, 93.
Overtures, 121.

Parish, another's (note), 79.
Parsonage to be in order, 74.
Partiality, 90.
Partisan politics, 59.
Pastoral calling, 85, 87, 89.
Pastoral office, 85.
Pastoral tie, 77.
Personal mention, 142.
Personal safety, rule regarding, 23.
Physical well-being, 34.
Plagiarism, 144.
Political questions, 57.
Political entanglements, 61.
Possidius's "Augustine," 24.
Posture in prayer, 137.
Prayer in the home, 88.
Prayer, public, 55, 136.
Prayer with the sick, 94.
Preachers' meeting, 36.
Predecessor, duty to, 67.
Predecessor's enemies, 70.
Predecessor's friends, 69.
Preliminary prayer, 132.
Preparation of minister, 130.
Presbyterian Code, 12, 172.
President Wilson quoted, 33.
Professional consciousness, 10.
Professionalism, 88.
Prison visiting, 103.
Privileges of minister, 56.
Processional, 131.
Proselytizing condemned, 81.
Publicity, Church, 125.
Pulpit, another's, 79.
Pulpit, control of, 117.
Pulpit freedom discussed, 20.
Pulpit proprieties, 132.
Punctuality, 132.

Records, Church, 120.
References, General, 12.
Renting Church property, 119.
Resignation from pulpit, 124.
Rest and recreation, 35.
Retiring minister, 74.
Rights of local Church, 116.
Ring ceremony, 164.
Russell, Dr. James E., quoted, 94.

Salary, ministerial (note), 25.
Schism, 114.
Scripture readings, 138.
Sensational preaching, 141.
Sermon, the, 141.
Sick, visits to, 93.
Simony, 26.
Singing at funerals, 150.
Slang, 143.
Special service, 131.
Spiritual life, 140.
Study, the pastor's, 38.
Successor, duty to, 72.

Time, the minister's, 25, 117, 118 (note).
Trial sermon, 123.

Unitarian Code, 13, 173.
Unselfishness, 7.

Vacations, 37.

Visiting jails, 103.
Visiting minister, 146.
Visiting minister, duty to, 80.
Visiting other Church homes, 82.
Volunteer social service work, 32.

Wedding, the, 164.
Welcome to new pastor, 73.
Wesley, referred to, 38.
Whyte, Dr. Alexander, 60.
Withdrawal from Church, 111, 113.
Women, relations with, 101.
Working library, 40.
Worship, public, 128.

UNITED THEO SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BV4012.H3
Harmon, Nolan Ministerial ethics and eti
3 0645 0003 9834 3